VOLUME XVI

No. 2

The Catholic Historical Review

EDITORS

PETER GUILDAY

GEORGE BONIFACE STRATEMEIER

LEO FRANCIS STOCK

JULY, 1930

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY PRESS

SINGLE COPIES $1.00 ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION $4.00

THE CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW

Official Organ of the American Catholic Historical Association

BOOK REVIEWS

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address may be addressed to the Catholic University Press, 12 S. Sharp St., Baltimore, Md., or to The Catholic Historical Review, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Address communications concerning articles, reviews, and all matters of editorial policy and work to The Editors, The Catholic Historical Review, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Published quarterly by
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY PRESS, 12 S. Sharp Street, Baltimore, Md.
EDITORIAL OFFICES: Catholic University, Washington, D. C.
Printed by J. H. Furst Co., Baltimore, Md.

Entered as second-class matter at the post-office at Baltimore, Md., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

The Catholic Historical Review

Volume XVI JULY, 1930 No. 2

THE PARLIAMENTS OF THE MIDDLE AGES AND THE EARLY MODERN PERIOD.*

It is generally agreed that one of the greatest achievements of the Middle Ages was the development of the representative system and of parliaments. It is largely, though perhaps not sufficiently, recognized that in the general scheme of the evolution of European states, between the age of feudalism and the era of absolute monarchy, there intervenes a period of what may be called parliamentary monarchy, of quasi-constitutionalism, of experiments—practically for the first time in history—with representative institutions. This period extends roughly from the thirteenth to the seventeenth century. The hallmark of it is the fact that the power of the crown was then more or less extensively limited by that of assemblies, in part elective, whose members, though directly and immediately representing only the politically active classes, were also regarded as representing in a general way the whole population of the land. But the historians who have treated of the representative institutions of this period have usually confined their studies to one or two or three countries. In America and Britain attention has been centered almost entirely on the English Parliament, the French States-General, or the Spanish Cortes.

* Read at the Tenth Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, Washington, D. C., December 28, 1929.

What has not been adequately recognized, in the first place, is the universality of the phenomenon. The fact is that class-parliaments or assemblies of estates arose not merely in the three kingdoms of the British Isles, but in all the realms of the Iberian peninsula, in France and all the French provinces, in the Holy Roman Empire and in nearly all the territorial states of Germany, the Netherlands, and Italy, in the Scandinavian kingdoms, Hungary, Bohemia, Poland, and Muscovy. Except for the municipal republics of Germany and Italy, where assemblies of estates were obviously out of the question, and the Balkan lands, where the Turkish conquest cut short the natural course of development, parliaments are found in this period in every state in Europe from Scotland to Hungary and from Portugal to Russia.

These hundreds of parliaments, national and provincial, ought to be studied comparatively, if we are ever to have an adequate conception of the constitutional development of Europe as a whole, and not simply a set of generalizations based on the history of three or four of the larger countries. But no such comparative study has ever been made. From the lack of it many misconceptions have arisen: *e. g.,* that the English Parliament was in nearly every respect unique, or that England was the only country in Europe that developed a vigorous and effective parliamentary system, or that England alone preserved its parliament uninterruptedly from the Middle Ages down to the nineteenth century.

In a paper like this it is obviously impossible to enter into any detailed treatment of so vast a field. But since no one has yet undertaken to present even a brief comparative survey of the whole group of European parliaments of that age, from Edinburgh and Lisbon to Moscow, perhaps it may be of interest to make that attempt here.

The assemblies in question went by various names: "Parliament", in England, Ireland, Scotland, Sicily, Naples, and the Papal States, and (for certain special assemblies) in Aragon, Catalonia, and Valencia (in Spanish and Italian "*Parlamento*"); "*Cortes*" for the ordinary parliaments of Portugal and the Spanish kingdoms; "States-General" and "Provincial Estates" in

France and the Netherlands; "*Stati*" in Piedmont, but "*Congregazioni generali*" for the estates representing the whole of the territories of the House of Savoy; "*Reichstag*" in the Holy Roman Empire, and "*Landtag*" in the German territorial states; "*Rigsdag*" in Denmark and Norway; "*Riksdag*" in Sweden; "*Sněm*" and "*Sejm*" ("assemblies") in Bohemia and Poland respectively; "*Országgyülés*" and "*Zemski Sobor*" ("assemblies of the land") in Hungary and Russia—although for all the parliaments of Central and Northern Europe the custom of our language is to say "Diet".

These assemblies usually arose in that stage of political evolution when, amid the decay of feudalism, the prince, engaged in building up a more unified and more highly organized national or territorial state, but not yet strong enough to proceed as he liked, autocratically, felt the need of enlisting the support of the politically active classes of the population; when the nobles, no longer able to rule independently in their localities, might still hope by corporate organization and collective action to wield a large power over the common state; and when through the growth of cities a vigorous new social class had come to the front with important interests to defend and often with ambitions to have a voice in public affairs equal to that of the older privileged classes. Between the crown, on the one hand, and the leading social classes on the other, a certain equilibrium had been reached, and collaboration and mutual concessions were necessary. More concretely, it was the ever growing financial needs of the crown—the need of larger revenues than those supplied by the domain lands and the customary feudal aids—that usually conduced most powerfully to the calling of the first parliaments. Other factors that sometimes operated were: disputed successions to the throne (Denmark, Norway); foreign invasion (Scotland, Sweden); the desire of the princes for popular support against the magnates (Hungary, Russia), or against the Papacy (France, Portugal). The crown most commonly took the initiative in the introduction of these assemblies. But cases are not lacking in which the subjects (through "leagues", "confederations", "unions") forced a weak govern-

ment or a tyrannical ruler to take them into organized consultation (Aragon, Bohemia, various German and Netherlands territories).

The practice of consultation through parliaments seems in most countries to have arisen from a development of the old *curia regis*. Medieval rulers were accustomed, for treating more important public affairs, to expand their ordinary " court " or " council " into a large assembly (" *curia solemnis* ", " *curia plena* ", " *magnum concilium* ", " *colloquium* ", " *congregatio* ", " *Hoftag* ", etc.), which might be attended by most or all of the prelates, magnates, and tenants-in-chief, and in some countries by all the nobility. It was natural that, with the urban renaissance, " men of the good towns " or other spokesmen of the commons should occasionally be called to these gatherings, when matters affecting them were to come up. In order that these sessions of the enlarged *curia regis* should be turned into parliaments, three things were necessary: (1) that the consultation of all the leading social classes, especially of the townsmen, should become regular and not remain purely sporadic; (2) that their mode of representation should assume fixed forms; and (3) that these assemblies, instead of being called merely to acclaim decisions already reached by the prince, should be admitted to an effective collaboration with him and to a certain measure of power and responsibility.

For some time, indeed, an alternative method of consulting the population was extensively practiced. Especially when it was a question of raising money, but often for other purposes as well, the crown would send its agents around the country to negotiate separately with the local communities or with certain social groups. Before long it was, of course, discovered that this procedure was cumbersome, slow, and uncertain: that the more effective plan would be, instead of having the representatives of the king go to the country, to have the representatives of the country come to the king. Nevertheless, long after central parliaments had been introduced, the crown continued in most countries occasionally to prefer the method of treating with each local community or with each class separately, for taxation especially. And in countries where

the local assemblies had become strongly entrenched, they often served as organs for the election of deputies to the parliaments, which thus appeared as "concentrations of local machinery" (England, Poland, Hungary).

It is customary to date the establishment of medieval parliaments from the time when the commons, normally represented by the townsmen, first gained admission to the national or territorial assemblies. This procedure, though open to many objections, is justified in as far as the admission of the "third estate" was, indeed, the decisive step in the transformation of the older feudal and clerical assemblies into something that might pass for a representation of the whole population. Moreover, some use of dates is necessary if we are to have any coherent picture of the course of this "wave of parliamentarism", which slowly overspread the continent. Hence it may be permissible to draw up a chronological table showing the relative priority or tardiness of the various countries in the establishment of parliaments, taking as a rough criterion the dates at which elected deputies of the cities first began to be summoned more or less regularly to the national or territorial assemblies.

It is a vexed question precisely where assemblies of the three estates first appeared in Europe. One can find vague allusions to such gatherings as being held in Catalonia in 1064 [1]; in Navarre in 1134 [2]; in Aragon in 1162 or 1163 [3]; in Agenais in 1182 [4]; in Béarn in "the twelfth century" [5]; in Savoy in "the middle of the twelfth century".[6] Leaving out of account such uncertain be-

[1] Marichalar y Manrique, *Historia de la legislación y recitaciones del derecho civil de España*, vol. VI, pp. 516 f.; Ballesteros y Beretta, *Historia de España*, vol. III, p. 496.

[2] Altamira y Crevea, *Historia de España*, vol. I, p. 498.

[3] Danvila y Collado, *Las libertades de Aragón*, pp. 326 f.; Marichalar y Manrique, *op. cit.*, vol. VI, pp. 180 f., 520; Ballesteros y Beretta, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 625.

[4] Lafforgue, *Histoire d'Auch*, vol. I, p. 351, cited in Dognon, *Les Institutions politiques et administratives du pays de Languedoc*, p. 196.

[5] Cadier, *Les États de Béarn*, pp. 4, 51 f.; Holtzmann, *Französische Verfassungsgeschichte*, p. 209.

[6] Salvioli, *Manuale di storia del diritto italiano*, p. 212.

ginnings, we may, using the criterion defined above, arrange the order in which something that may be called a parliament appears in the several more important European countries as follows:

1188 León,
1218 Catalonia,
1232 Sicily and Naples,
1233 Languedoc,
1250 Castile,
1254 Portugal,
1255 Germany (the Diet of the Empire),
1274 Aragon, Navarre,
1280 Bohemia, Brandenburg,
1281 Austria,
1283 Valencia,
1286 Piedmont,
1295 England,
1300 Ireland,
1302 France (the States-General),
1307 Bavaria,
1309 Brittany,
1326 Scotland,
1337 Normandy,
1350 Saxony,
1397-8 Hungary,
1435 Sweden,
1468 Denmark,
1493 Poland,
1498 Norway,
1613 Russia.

In general, the wave seems to have started down around the Pyrenees—whether on the southern or on the northern side is not quite certain—in the later twelfth century. In the thirteenth century it overspread the Iberian peninsula, many Italian states, and perhaps southern France. Around 1300 it had reached the British Isles. In the fourteenth century it spread to nearly every province or territorial state of France, the Netherlands, and Germany (in the stronger states of Eastern Germany assemblies of estates appear even in the thirteenth century). The Scandinavian

kingdoms, Hungary and Poland, developed their parliaments only in the last century of the Middle Ages; and in Russia, although the great national assemblies called *Zemski Sobors* begin apparently in 1550, the presence in them of elected deputies of the towns cannot be proved before 1613.

With the notable exception of England, where class distinctions were relatively weak and confused, virtually all the parliaments here in question were essentially assemblies of estates, organized to represent primarily the leading social classes; and this outstanding class-character is one of the chief differences between them and modern parliaments. With respect to the classes represented, however, some divergences of practice are to be marked.

The clergy, usually considered "the first estate", appear at some time in virtually all the assemblies here considered. As a separate estate, however, they voluntarily dropped out of the national parliament in England (after the middle of the fourteenth century), Naples, Poland, Hungary, and Castile, except in so far as, in the first four countries named, the presence of the prelates among the barons could be considered a representation of the whole clerical body. After the Reformation this estate also vanished from the parliaments of most of the Protestant German states, the Dutch Republic, and (most of the time) Scotland.

Nobles and gentry ("barons", "lords", "knights", "serving men"—by whatsoever name they might be called) were a class almost invariably found in these assemblies, although in the sixteenth century they drop out in Castile, Württemberg, and some minor territories.

The "burgesses of the good towns" were another element that was almost never lacking. They ceased to attend the Polish Diet, however, by the close of the sixteenth century; and in Bohemia, Moravia, and Hungary in the later years of the Old Régime their rôle was reduced to such nullity that they might as well have ceased to attend.

In contrast to the townsmen, the peasantry enjoyed representation only in a few instances: in the French States-General, in

Switzerland, the Tyrol, Friesland, Norway,[7] Sweden, and (until 1627) Denmark.

In general, the representation of classes was narrowest in Flanders, where the cities seem from the first to have monopolized the Diet; in Poland, where the nobility ultimately did virtually the same; and in Castile, where after 1538 the Cortes was left solely to the Third Estate (the cities). At the other extreme stand the Swedish or Norwegian Diets, and especially the French States-General, which from the later fifteenth century on, must be called by far the most broadly representative of all these assemblies.

The States-General in its later form stands out not only because of the completeness with which all classes—clergy, nobles, townsmen, and peasants— were represented in it, but also because all classes elected their delegates, and through an electoral procedure more highly organized than in any other country, and by what in the rural districts, at least, amounted almost to universal suffrage.[8] In sharp contrast to this, for most parliaments the rule was that election was practiced only for the representation of the towns and of the peasants (where these latter had representatives). And even for the towns, in many cases election was replaced by the sending *ex officio* of certain municipal dignitaries, or the choice of the town's representatives by the municipal council, or their designation by drawing lots, or their more or less thinly disguised appointment by the crown. Where election did exist, it was carried out with such an endless variety of rules and forms that generalizations about it are almost impossible.

The clergy were represented in most medieval parliaments only by prelates sitting *jure suo*. Elected deputies representing the whole clerical body are found only in a few instances, notably in the French States-General and the Diets of Norway and Sweden.

As for the nobility, most commonly every member of this class

[7] In Norway the peasants outnumbered all other classes combined at the *Hyldingsmøder* (Diets held to do homage to a new king), but were rarely called to the *Bevilgningsmøder* (Diets held for purposes of taxation).

[8] *Cf.* especially Picot, "Les Élections aux États-Généraux dans les provinces de 1302 à 1614," in *Séances et Travaux de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques*, vol. CII, pp. 5-33, 209-221.

had the right to attend parliament. This was the rule in Scotland,* Portugal, all the Spanish kingdoms (except in Castile where only those whom the crown summoned attended), nearly all the Provincial Estates of France and the Netherlands, the German *Landtage,* in the Scandinavian kingdoms, and in Naples and Sicily. The evils of such a system were numerous and patent. It resulted too often in swamping a parliament with hordes of poverty-stricken, ignorant, and turbulent country squires, ready to sell their lungs or their votes to the highest bidder, or else eager only to rush the assembly's business through at once or turn it over to a committee in order to get home as soon as possible. But so strong was the prejudice that all noblemen ought to have at least the right of attending, whether as a patriotic duty or in order to circumvent the schemes of the crown or the oligarchs, that the rival system of having the mass of the nobility represented by elected deputies could seldom prevail. It did prevail chiefly in countries too large to permit of the personal attendance of most noblemen. Apart from the well-known and not altogether analogous case of England and Ireland, where the gentry and freeholders chose the "knights of the shire" in the county court, the nobles of France came to elect their deputies to the States-General in *bailliage* assemblies; those of Hungary chose their representatives in parliament at their "county congregations"; those of Poland did the same in their "dietines"; those of East Prussia in their *Aemter* gatherings; and those of Muscovy in their *uiezd* assemblies. But all efforts to introduce this system in such large realms as Bohemia, Denmark, and Sweden-Finland failed.

In their forms of meeting and deliberating nearly all the parliaments here surveyed present great similarities. Almost everywhere the king or prince alone had the right of summoning the assembly. As a rule, the letters of convocation specified more or less clearly the matters to come up in the impending session,

* It was only after long efforts on the part of the crown, going back as far as the days of James I, to reform parliament on the English model, that in 1587 the mass of the Scots nobles lost the right or burden of attending in person, and the system of elected "barons of the shires" was introduced. *Cf.* Rait, *The Scottish Parliament before the Union of the Crown,* pp. 22 ff.

though the crown usually avoided this unpleasant necessity whenever it felt strong enough to do so. The place of meeting ordinarily depended only on the choice of the ruler. Almost any town large enough to accommodate such a gathering might serve; and sometimes meetings were even held in the open country, like the Polish Election Diets, the old Hungarian assemblies on the Rákos field, or the early *Parlamento* of Friuli on horseback on the plain of Campoformio. Regularity as to the time of meeting was also decidedly the exception. Although in nearly every country the estates frequently demanded and the rulers sometimes promised annual or biennial or triennial parliaments, such promises were not very strictly observed. Nevertheless, while in some countries (*e. g.,* France, Denmark, Russia) the national assembly was called only rarely, and under exceptional circumstances, in most countries meetings were held rather frequently—every two or three years, or even annually.

The session was almost invariably opened by a speech from the throne, delivered to all the estates jointly, outlining the royal or princely propositions, which commonly centered around a demand for subsidies. After this the assembly usually broke up into the various "houses" or "estates" or "*curiae*" in which it was accustomed to deliberate. And on this matter of the division into houses, so all-important for the efficient working of a parliament, practice varied widely. Numerous examples can be cited of every system from one chamber up to four chambers.

An assembly consisting of only one house appears in Castile (after 1538) and in Flanders, since all orders except the cities had been eliminated, and in certain parliaments where all classes were accustomed to sit together in one chamber, although sometimes voting by estates—as in Scotland, Languedoc, Piedmont, and Naples.

Bicameralism, often regarded as one of those unique inventions or happy accidents that have made the fortune of England, was, in fact, practiced in many countries. It might arise through the disappearance of one of the three estates usually found in these assemblies: of the clergy (as in most of the Protestant German

territories or the Diets of the Dutch Republic), or of the nobility (*e. g.,* in Württemberg). Sometimes the upper classes might sit together as an upper house ("*grand corps*") and the commoners as a lower chamber ("*second corps*"), as in various French Provincial Estates. The development in England, whereby the House of Lords grew out of the old enlarged King's Council (*Magnum Concilium*), and the House of Commons out of the union in one chamber of the elected deputies of the shires and boroughs, was closely paralleled in Poland and Hungary. In these latter realms the *Magnum Concilium* reappears as the Senate or Table of Magnates, composed of prelates and high officials, while a lower house, the Chamber or Table of Deputies, was formed from the elected representatives of the nobility and cities (the urban element, however, quickly disappearing in Poland).

By far the commonest arrangement on the continent was a division into three houses. Usually it was—clergy, nobles, and cities, as in Portugal, Navarre, Catalonia, Valencia, the States-General and most Provincial Estates in France[10] and in the Netherlands, Sicily, many German Diets, Denmark (after the elimination of peasant deputies), and, apparently, Russia. Elsewhere tricameralism arose from the fact that while the clergy vanished as a separate estate, the greater and the lesser nobility formed distinct *curiae* (Bohemia, Saxony, Silesia, East Prussia). The division of the German Imperial Diet into three *curiae,* electors, princes, and cities, was a somewhat analogous arrangement.

Finally, a four-chamber parliament sometimes appears, representing either clergy, magnates, lesser nobles, and cities (as in Aragon, Austria, Styria, and Moravia), or clergy, nobles, towns, and peasants (as in Sweden, Norway, Denmark down to 1627, and the Tyrol).

A division into three or four houses greatly aggravated two other characteristic weaknesses of the parliaments of that period:

[10] In the French States-General the peasants were also represented, as has been explained above, but their deputies combined with those of the towns to form the Third Estate.

the difficulty of agreeing as to how valid decisions were to be arrived at, and the widespread use of imperative mandates.

Almost everywhere it was long disputed whether, as between the several estates or chambers, unanimity was required in order to pass a measure, whether two estates could "bind" a third, or whether the commons must accept whatever the higher orders agreed upon. Usually the rule prevailed that the consent of all the estates was necessary—with resulting complications when it was a question of bringing three or four estates into line. Sometimes, however, the difficulty was avoided by providing that decisions should be reached by majority vote of the parliament sitting together as a kind of committee of the whole. This system, practiced, *e. g.,* in Languedoc and sometimes in the French States-General, usually favored the Third Estate, as outnumbering all the rest. But occasionally it worked out the other way, as in Bohemia, where ultimately the towns were reduced to having only a single collective vote: *i. e.,* for parliamentary decisions all the cities of the kingdom together counted for no more than one poor country squire.[11]

Even more difficult was the problem within individual estates of establishing majority rule. The old idea that, over and above the ordinary feudal obligations, no one could be bound to anything to which he had not freely consented; the tradition that single lords or provinces or cities might bargain separately with the crown, outside parliament and for a time even in parliament; the extreme importance attached by the privileged classes to their personal or local "liberties"; the danger of troubles or even civil war if the majority attempted to impose their will on strongly reluctant colleagues; the principle of the Roman law, *Vota non sunt numeranda, sed ponderanda*—all these things long combined to uphold the idea that a majority vote need not necessarily carry a measure, that the opposition of a considerable and determined minority sufficed to thwart a project, or even that unanimity was required for a decision. In most parliaments, indeed, the principle of majority rule was sooner or later established. But there

[11] Dénis, *La Bohême depuis la Montagne-Blanche,* vol. I, p. 321.

are numerous examples to show the long survival or the reappearance of the older ideas.

For taxes, at least, unanimous agreement was necessary, so it was claimed in Castile,[12] in the German Reichstag,[13] in the Papal States.[14] In the Dutch Republic unanimity was required for decisions of the States-General about taxes, peace or war, and for decisions of the Provincial Estates about a large and indefinite number of questions.[15] In the Swiss Federal Diet almost all matters could be settled only by unanimous vote.[16] In Hungary a statute of 1495 provided that a question on which parliament divided was to be settled *per sententiam sanioris partis*: *i. e.*, by the opinion, not necessarily of the majority, but, as it was interpreted, "of the wiser and more powerful part of the nation".[17] In the Russian *Zemski Sobors* the majority principle seems never to have been established.[18] In Catalonia, where majority rule did prevail among clergy and cities, unanimity was required in the noble estate, so that a single nobleman could thwart a project by declaring, *Yo dissent.*[19] In Valencia all decisions, to be valid, must be passed by the noblesse *nemine discrepante* [20]—hence the pleasant tale of a certain incorrigible minority of one which could be overcome only by throwing "the idiot" into the street.[21] In Aragon unanimous agreement was demanded not only in one estate, but in all four; and any member could defeat a proposal merely by uttering the word, *Disiento.* Old writers jested that any law or act of the Cortes in Aragon was a miracle.[22] But the

[12] Altamira y Crevea, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 74.

[13] Schröder, *Lehrbuch der deutschen Rechtsgeschichte*, p. 824.

[14] Pertile, *Storia del diritto italiano*, vol. II, p. 345, note 78.

[15] Fruin, *Geschiedenis der Staatsinstellingen in Nederland*, pp. 182 f., 230, 304.

[16] Bluntschli, *Geschichte des schweizerischen Bundesrechtes*, vol. I, pp. 402 ff.

[17] Marczali, *Ungarische Verfassungsgeschichte*, pp. 58, 65.

[18] Sergieevich, *Lektsii i izsliedovaniia po istorii russkago prava*, pp. 728 f.

[19] Pella y Forgas, *Llibertats y antich govern de Catalunya*, p. 146.

[20] Marichalar y Manrique, *op. cit.*, vol. VII, pp. 455 f.

[21] Merriman "The Cortes of the Spanish Kingdoms in the later Middle Ages," *American Hist. Review*, vol. XVI, p. 493 (Apr., 1911).

[22] Marichalar y Manrique, *op. cit.*, vol. VI, pp. 217 f.

acme of exaggerated individualism was reached in Poland with the famous Liberum Veto, through which, as practiced from 1652 on, a single member of the Diet, by the simple formula, *Nie pozwalam* ("I will not permit"), could not only thwart the proposal to which he objected, but also dissolve the Diet at once and nullify all the decisions previously made by the assembly.[23]

Another bane of medieval parliaments was the system of imperative mandates. A deputy, being considered as an ambassador or procurator more than as a national counsellor, usually received from his constituents more or less detailed instructions, which often limited and hampered him in the extreme. If the matters to come up in parliament were known in advance, he might have the line that he was to follow absolutely prescribed: if not, he might be ordered to agree to nothing without consulting his constituents. Still further to increase his sense of responsibility, he might be required, at the close of parliament, to give a full account of his conduct at a special meeting of the local assembly that had elected him (as in the "relation" dietines or congregations of Poland, Hungary, and East Prussia). Severe punishments might threaten one who overstepped his mandate: in Switzerland, for instance, more than one deputy paid with his head for so doing.[24]

While practice varied greatly in different countries and at different periods, in general it may be said that more or less imperative mandates were widely used in almost every parliament of the period, except in England and Aragon. Although the system had its merits in strengthening the hands of the estates against the crown, it was on the whole disastrous, particularly because of the endless delays resulting from it, and because it tended to the settlement of national questions on the basis of narrow local views and interests. Especially in certain countries like Castile, France, Germany, Poland, and Hungary, this was one of the worst obstacles to the efficient functioning of the national assembly.

Parliamentary technique, though in general still crude, does

[23] There is at last an excellent monograph on this extraordinary practice in Konopczyński, *Liberum Veto, studyum porównawczo-hystoryczne*, Cracow, 1918.

[24] Bluntschli, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 397.

show various interesting developments in that period. One was the extensive use of committees. Often they were employed during the sessions of the assembly to effect an agreement between the estates or with the crown; to draft responses, petitions, or legislation; to handle special matters, such as those that required secrecy, or judicial business. Some parliaments came near to abdicating their functions into the hands of a committee. In Naples, for instance, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the *Parlamento-Generale* did little save to vote the subsidies and then elect a committee called the *Parlamento-Senato,* which attended to nearly all other business.[25] Still more omnipotent was the famous committee in Scotland called the "Lords of the Articles", which from the later fourteenth to the seventeenth century almost replaced the national assembly, at times even legislating and levying taxes quite independently. As late as the reign of Charles I, the Scots Parliament was wont to meet only twice in a session: the first time to choose the Lords of the Articles, and the second time to go through the form of sanctioning what they had done.[26] And in various German states in the later period full meetings of the Diet virtually ceased to be held, being replaced by committees of the estates (*Ausschusstage*). Finally, one may note the custom of electing a committee which, during the intervals between parliamentary sessions, was to watch over the liberties of the estates, or the execution of decisions or laws made in parliament, or to carry on various political, administrative, or financial tasks that parliament had assumed. In the eastern Spanish kingdoms, in certain French provinces like Languedoc or Brittany, in Naples and Sicily, and in nearly all the German states these standing committees ("Deputations", "*Ausschüsse*") became one of the most important elements in the political life of the country, largely making up for infrequent or irregular meetings of parlia-

[25] Carignani, "L'ultimo parlamento nazionale del regno di Napoli", *Archivio storico per le provincie napoletane,* vol. VIII (1883), pp. 44 ff.

[26] *Cf.* Rait, *op. cit.,* pp. 40 ff.; Terry, *The Scottish Parliament, its Constitution and Procedure,* 1603-1707, pp. 13 ff., 103 ff.

ment and subjecting the crown to a considerable measure of supervision and control.

Medieval assemblies usually ended, as they began, with a joint session of all the estates in the presence of the prince or his representatives. In some lands like France or Castile, these final sessions were likely to be perfunctory and meaningless, the king, after wringing taxes out of the deputies, being chiefly anxious to send them home at once without listening to their grievances. But in many countries the final session had the utmost importance. It was then and then alone that parliament effectually transacted business. For the custom had arisen that none of the agreements previously reached during the assembly should be regarded as definitive until at the end all of them—the concessions made by the estates to the crown and the concessions made by the crown to the estates—were gathered up into one great final act, which, after being solemnly sanctioned by crown and estates alike at the final session, acquired binding force. This system of "final acts", "articles", "capitulations", "recesses", or whatsoever they might be called, is found in Scotland, Aragon, Catalonia, Valencia, Sicily, all the German Diets, Sweden, Bohemia, Hungary, and Poland. As a technical device for binding the crown and making the grant of taxes dependent upon the redress of grievances, it was admirable; but its disadvantages are obvious, particulary the fact that if a parliament broke up without coming to a "final act", all the previous work of the session went for nothing. At any rate, such compacts between crown and estates, almost like treaties between independent sovereigns, illustrate the dualistic conception of the state that underlies the parliamentarism of this period in its more developed forms.

The competence of these assemblies can seldom be defined with any accuracy, for it was bounded by no systematic constitutions of the modern sort. The estates almost everywhere did, indeed, at one time or another wring from their rulers written recognition of their rights in this or that respect; and, apart from this, the unwritten law of customs and precedents generally established for them a certain more or less incontestable sphere of activity. But

at bottom everything depended on the ever-varying political situation and the ever-shifting balance of power as between the crown and the estates. Whenever the crown felt strong enough, it was prone to forget, to deny, or to ride roughshod over inconvenient parliamentary rights, no matter whether they were based on custom or on sacred charters. And when the prince was weak, or a minor, or badly in debt, or the land in a great crisis, the estates in their turn were likely to take the bit in their teeth, to extend their scope almost without limits, or even virtually to sequestrate the government. When the crown was up, parliament was down, and vice versa—that is the most general rule that can be laid down in the matter.

The most constant and important activity of the estates was the granting of taxes. *Landtage sind Geldtage*—that German adage might have been applied to nearly all these parliaments. Almost everywhere (save in Russia, Denmark, and Norway), the principle came to be recognized that, apart from the old feudal and domain revenues, no taxes could be imposed without the consent of the estates. It was by exploiting the power of the purse that not only the English Parliament but many Continental ones raised themselves to a high degree of power and indispensability. And it may be said that in most countries the sole right of the estates to grant taxes was, on the whole, well maintained down to the seventeenth century. There is, however, the well-known exception of France, where the States-General lost this power from 1440 on, and the Provincial Estates, from about the same period, could do little more than debate how taxes that could not be escaped might best be paid.

The second chief sphere of parliamentary activity was in legislation. All these assemblies had at least some influence in this field, through their right to present petitions and grievances (*cahiers de doléances, greujes, agravís, postulata, gravamina*), which even in countries like France furnished the stimulus and the material for a great deal of royal law-making. The French States-General and the Castilian and Portuguese Cortes in the later period scarcely got beyond this. But nothing could be more erroneous than the

assumption often made (by writers whose knowledge of Continental systems hardly extends beyond France or Castile) that the English Parliament was the only assembly of that time that discovered how to gain effective legislative power by making grants of supply depend on redress of grievances, and by drawing up their demands in the form of "bills" ready to become "acts" as soon as they received the royal sanction. In fact both these devices came to be practiced in most Continental parliaments: in the eastern Spanish kingdoms, Sicily, the German states, Sweden, Poland, Bohemia, and Hungary. Usually this did not exclude a certain amount of legislation by the crown without the sanction of the estates; but, on the other hand, in Germany at least within certain spheres the estates could legislate without the sanction of the crown.[27] In general, the principle was widespread that all more important laws ought to be made only with the consent and participation of parliament; and there were kingdoms like Poland or Aragon where this principle was very strictly carried out.

Thirdly, there was a vast range of functions which most parliaments sometimes arrogated to themselves, especially in times of crisis and confusion, and some of which were exercised for long periods by some of these assemblies. Foreign relations were a matter in which most estates often claimed a voice. They wished to be consulted about war, peace, alliances, treaties; nay, sometimes they sent and received embassies, raised armies, and concluded peace or alliances quite of their own authority. Similarly, the history of most parliaments shows attempts to dictate the choice of the prince's advisers or to force upon him a council formally elected by the estates (which the Swedish kings had to submit to through much of the eighteenth century). There are many cases of a parliament appointing a regent, fixing the succession to the throne, or even for long periods freely electing its rulers. Even more common was the custom that the estates should prescribe how the taxes they granted should be expended, or should

[27] *Cf.* Rachfahl, "Der dualistische Ständestaat in Deutschland", *Jahrbuch für Gesetzgebung, Verwaltung und Volkswirtschaft*, 26. Jhrg. (1902), pp. 169 ff.

undertake the collection and disbursement through their own agents and treasury. Many parliaments (*e. g.,* the eastern Spanish kingdoms, Languedoc, Brittany, the German states) came to have quite a staff of permanent officials of their own, and to take a large part not only in the financial but in the general administration of the country. Finally, the assumption sometimes made that the English Parliament alone combined the functions of a legislative and tax-granting body with those of a high court of justice is by no means true: many Continental assemblies of estates present the same combination of functions (*e. g.,* in Aragon, Poland, and universally among the German states).

It is also a mistake, and a not uncommon one, to suppose that all the Continental estates died premature deaths as in France, and that England alone kept her parliament continuously down to modern times. It is true that the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries saw the extinction of not a few of the old parliaments. They disappear in most of the French provinces (under Richelieu and Louis XIV), in Portugal (after 1697), the eastern Spanish kingdoms (1707-14), Naples (after 1634), Piedmont (after 1582), Savoy (after 1766), in some of the German territories, like Bavaria (after 1669), in Denmark and Norway (after 1661), in Russia (after 1682). But they survived down to the French Revolution in many instances: in a dozen French provinces, in Castile, Navarre, Sicily, the Dutch Republic, Belgium, the German Imperial Diet, many German states (like Saxony and Hanover), Austria, Bohemia, Hungary, Poland, and Sweden. In most of these cases, indeed, the hand of the monarch was heavy upon them, and the estates seemed sunk in lethargy or stricken with palsy. But in some instances—notably in Sweden, Poland, Hungary, and among the German states especially in Württemberg—the old parliaments continued to show a great deal of life and activity down to the end.

The assemblies that have been surveyed here had many defects and weaknesses. They were not, at least for modern times, sufficiently representative: they rested on too narrow a class basis. In their later, decadent period they generally tended to identify themselves too much with antiquated political and social ideals,

and with selfish class and local interests. In most cases the crown prevailed over them because it, better than they, represented the trend towards national unity, social equality, and efficient government. These parliaments suffered equally from the lack of solidarity and coöperation among the several social classes: from those jealousies and conflicts between the estates which played such a rôle in France in 1789, or which enabled the Danish crown in 1660 by a *coup d'état* to make itself absolute. And there are many other weaknesses that might be listed: the chaotic methods of electing deputies, imperative mandates, the multiplicity of chambers, the difficulty of enforcing the will of the majority, the unpopularity which in many countries always clung to these assemblies because they were associated in men's minds only with new taxes, the desire so often manifested even by the privileged classes to escape from participating in parliament in order to avoid an ungrateful task and onerous responsibilities.

Nevertheless, the old parliaments in many ways rendered important services. They gave the crown what was on the whole, a fruitful and a long indispensable coöperation in building up, out of the chaos and disintegration of feudalism, the unified modern state. By drawing representatives of the leading social classes and of every locality together into regular collaboration on common problems, they helped much to create a sense of common interests and a national spirit. We may also be grateful to them for having through centuries implanted and maintained in most European countries certain precious ideas about constitutional liberty, the rights of peoples as against monarchs, no taxation without representation, government carried on through and with the consent of the governed, the representative system. Those ideas might be for a time obscured, but they were never lost. And when in the nineteenth century the new movements for democracy and constitutionalism set in, most European nations did not need to look abroad entirely for guidance: nearly everywhere the friends of liberty could find traditions, precedents, principles, and inspiration in the records of their own parliaments of the Middle Ages.

ROBERT HOWARD LORD.

A JUSTIFICATION OF INNOCENT III

In 1197 died Emperor Henry VI of the line of the Hohenstaufens, eldest son of Frederick Barbarossa, in the midst of extensive preparations for a crusade. He is described as a "cruel, crafty, and unscrupulous character", brilliantly talented, but inspired with a high-soaring, essentially selfish ambition. He planned to subject the Greek Empire and the whole Orient to his rule, and the crusade was ultimately to serve for this egotistic end.

Shortly before his death he had his little son, Frederick, elected successor by the German princes, and he left him in possession of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, which Henry's wife, Constanza, had brought to the Hohenstaufens. As his own death followed so early, the Hohenstaufen party in Germany disregarded the "Sicilian Child" and proceeded to the election of his uncle, Duke Philip of Suabia, brother of Henry VI. Thereupon the Guelphic minority chose Otto of Brunswick, a son of Barbarossa's opponent Henry the Lion, and a nephew of Richard the Lionhearted of England. Pope Innocent III (1198-1216), who evidently had the right to state which of the two he was willing to crown Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, was appealed to by both parties, and decided, after much hesitation and careful investigation, for Otto of Brunswick.[1]

This interference of the Pope has been the subject of much controversy. Some ultra-patriotic Germans condemn it as a disgrace to their nation. Others keep in mind the peculiar relation in which the German ruler, as candidate for the imperial crown, was to the Head of Christianity. They consequently recognize the right of Innocent III to have a hand in the matter. Others again

[1] A brief account of this double election and its consequences is in Guggenberger, *Hist. of the Christian Era*, vol. I, pp. 354 ff. To my knowledge there are only two reliable publications on the life of Innocent III, namely an exhaustive article, *Innocent III*, in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*; and vols. XI and XII of H. Mann's *Lives of the Popes*. These two volumes, sold separately, are a unit by themselves. They contain extensive accounts of the source material, and of previous publications on the great Pope in several languages.

maintain that the Pope eagerly seized the opportunity to emphasize his position and to bring out unmistakably the principles of the relation between empire and papacy. These principles, so it is stated, were those exaggerated claims which are wrongfully ascribed to Gregory VII.

We still possess official copies of all the letters which during that period passed between the Sovereign Pontiff and each of the two parties. These communications form a volume preserved in the Vatican archives, known as the *Registrum Domini Innocentii Tertii Papae Super Negotio Romani Imperii,* "Register of Pope Innocent III's Letters anent the Roman Empire", and are reprinted in Migne, *Patrologia Latina,* vol. 216, columns 995-1174.[2]

This *Registrum super Negotio Imperii Romani* has naturally been the subject of much study, and various conclusions have been drawn from it. Unfortunately only letters emanating from the Pope are dated and not even all of them. The letters arriving from the several parties and their followers or supporters have been copied into the Register generally without indication of the date. This circumstance is one of the causes of the differences in the interpretation of the whole correspondence. The Rev. William Peitz, S. J., professor of history in the Jesuit College Stella Matutina at Feldkirch, Austria, has during several years devoted his labor to an elucidation of the questions connected with this *Registrum.*[3] His studies on the Register of Innocent III resulted in a large publication written in Italian under the title, *Regestum Domini Innocentii Tertii Papae Super Negotio Romani Imperii . . . Con Introduzione di W. M. Peitz, S. J.* Six large folio pages of photographic facsimiles illustrate the

[2] On the papal letter registers in general and those of Innocent III in particular see an instructive passage in Mann, *Lives of the Popes,* vol. XI, pp. 1-4.

[3] Fr. Peitz is eminently qualified for this task. He has made the study of important collections of papal letters his life work, and is recognized as an authority in such matters. In 1911 he published *Das Original-Register Gregors VII im Vatikanischen Archiv*; on 1917, *Das Register Gregors I, Beiträge zur Kenntniss des päpstlichen Kanzlei- und Registerwesens bis auf Gregor VII*; in 1918, *Liber Diurnus, Beiträge zur Kenntniss der ältesten Kanzlei vor Gregor dem Grossen.*

various peculiarities of the manuscript, in particular the differences in the handwriting of the several scribes who executed the copying of the letters.

It cannot be the purpose of the present paper to enter into this matter with that extensiveness which the scholarly work really deserves. But with the assistance of an article contributed by Father Peitz to the *Historisches Jahrbuch,* (1926, pp. 354 ff.) an attempt will be made to clear up several of the knotty questions connected with the first fifteen numbers of the famous letter file. Generally we shall confine ourselves to the reproduction of the results of Father Peitz's researches. We shall, however, enter deeper than Father Peitz could into the contents of these letters, and endeavor to compile an historical account of the papal relation to the two royal candidates during the period, less than two years, covered by these fifteen letters.

One peculiarity of this remarkable record, which has ever remained unnoticed by the historical students and has therefore given rise to countless misunderstandings and misrepresentations is the fact that the letters reproduced in it are not entered in the chronological order in which they were received or dated, but simply in connection with some communication by which the Pope finally replied to them, or which was occasioned by them. They sometimes follow, but commonly precede this papal utterance. Hence it is necessary to distinguish certain clusters of letters, each cluster being more or less numerous but belonging to, or leading up to some papal communication.

Innocent III was elected on January 8, 1198. In the month of March of the same year, the Hohenstaufen party in Germany elected Philip. In May a less numerous Guelphic party chose Otto, who was duly crowned at Aachen in July by the Archbishop of Cologne.[4] In September adherents of Philip proceeded to a

[4] This was of course not the imperial coronation, which could be bestowed by the Pope alone in the Eternal City. After being elected, a German king was crowned by the Archbishop of Cologne at the venerable Residence of Charlemagne, where he was solemnly placed in the marble throne of the great Emperor. So far he was only King of Germany, preferably styled Roman King, or King of the Romans, because he was the candidate for the

second election, and had their candidate crowned illegally at Mainz by some other bishop (the Archbishop of Mainz being in the Holy Land). It has been maintained by some historians that both parties at once appealed to the Pope, or that Innocent III eagerly intruded himself as umpire. Father Peitz's researches show that for months neither party communicated with the Sovereign Pontiff. The letter by which Otto solemnly informed the Pope of his election and asked for ecclesiastical support, cannot have been written long before May 3, of the following year 1199, that is, in April or March.[5] The letter was delivered to the Sovereign Pontiff by a solemn embassy consisting of six prominent ecclesiastics. It is No. 3 of the Register. It was for the Pope the occasion to write immediately one letter to the Archbishop of Mainz, though this prelate was still absent on a crusade; and another one to all the ecclesiastical and secular magnates of Germany. These epistles represent the first step taken by Innocent III concerning the discord in Germany. Since it was more than likely that the matter would not be settled at once, but would entail a great deal of correspondence, it was decided on this occasion and at this time, *i. e.* in the spring of 1199, to enter all the communications referring to the "Affair of the Roman Empire," *De Negotio Romani Imperii,* into one separate record, apart from the ordinary books kept regularly in the Papal chancery. The very first entry, the letter to the Archbishop of Mainz, is dated May 3, 1199 (*V nonas Maji, pontificatus nostri anno secundo*), thus indicating when this important historical "letter file" was started.

In his epistle to the Archbishop of Mainz[6] Innocent III briefly

Imperial Crown. It was an unwritten privilege of the German nation, that only their kings were eligible for the imperial dignity, a privilege respected by the popes, though they always reserved the right to bestow the imperial crown on the ruler of some other country.

[5] As one of his envoys Otto mentions Henry of Aquileia, chaplain to the King of England. Hence the letter must have been written before April 6, the date of Richard's death, or at least before that event had become known in Germany. In his reply Innocent refers to Henry of Aquileia as capellanus *quondam. . . . Richardi Regis Anglorum.*

[6] Innocent had a high opinion of this worthy prelate, who was known to adhere still to the election of the little Frederick, a circumstance which gave

explains the conditions in Germany, the election and coronation of both candidates, and states that the sad dissension had already led to bloody and destructive civil war.[7] So far the Pope has remained neutral, showing no favor to either candidate, "although each of them claims to possess our good-will and support"—*in neutram partem voluimus declinare, licet uterque de favore nostro et benevolentia glorietur.* He does not urge the archbishop to hasten his return from the Orient, because his presence there might be of great usefulness, but he requests and even obliges him to declare by letter his view of the situation. Though not taking sides with either claimant Innocent does not fail to state that Otto has already solemnly promised not to injure the interests of the Church, and to undo the harm caused by certain practices of former Emperors. The Pope thereby intimates that no such pledge had come from Philip of Suabia.

In the letter to all the princes of Germany, which is No. 2 of the collection, the Pope reminds them of the close connection existing between papacy and empire. "Although all the Christian realms look upon the Roman Church as their mother, Germany ought to foster towards her a more intimate and ardent devotion, so that this country may yield to her assistance and defence, and in turn receive from her support in its necessities." He upbraids them for having induced the present disastrous condition, and for having failed to end the intestine war sooner, which they could have done either by coming to an agreement among themselves, or by having recourse to the Pope. But so far they have been *negligentes et desides,* careless and procrastinating. "We exhort

him a somewhat neutral position. The Pope soon employed him as legate. Though he did not come up to Innocent's expectations, there are those who believe that, had he not died in 1200 he would have succeeded in pacifying Germany. Emil Michael, S. J., *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes vom dreizehnten Jahrhundert bis zum Ende des Mittelalters*, vol. VI, p. 65.

[7] This was but too true. The districts which were the scene of these contests suffered terribly. "This war was not one in which the two parties in chivalrous tactics measured their strength. It was largely characterized by a frightful, vindictive, and repulsive fury, which did not shrink from the most brutal outrages. The worst sufferers were the lower and lowest classes, the helpless, the religious institutions, and the churches." (*Op. cit.*, p. 32.)

you and order you by this apostolic letter, to have the fear of God before your eyes, and in honest zeal for the glory of the Empire to strive more efficaciously for the appointment of a ruler. . . . Otherwise we shall be obliged to bring about what we ourselves think best, since longer delay entails serious danger; and to grant our apostolic favor to him whom we see to be recommended by better support and merits (*quem credemus majoribus studiis et meritis adjuvari*)."

It was the letter by which Otto formally announced his election to the Sovereign Pontiff, No. 3 of the Register, which prompted the Pope to apply to the chief representative of the opposing party to learn his side of the question, and to send the letter of reproach to the German princes with the injunction to settle the discord by a unanimous election or else to submit to his own decision. These three letters form one group of communications. Otto's epistle, however, also belongs to the following group, which consists of communications emanating from the various supporters of the Guelphic candidate, and it culminates in a reply of Innocent, addressed not to Otto himself but to his most prominent adherent, the Archbishop of Cologne. This group contains the numbers 4 to 11. The first two, 4 and 5, come from King Richard the Lion-hearted of England, who intercedes ardently for his nephew Otto. It is sure that No. 4 must have been written shortly after July 12, 1198, on which day Otto was crowned at Aachen, since it refers to this event as having taken place *nuper*, recently, and must have been received in Rome a little later. Had Innocent III been resolved earlier than May 3, 1199, to start a separate list for the letters concerning the German elections, this letter would have been the very first, because it seems sure that Richard the Lionhearted wrote to the Pope in the election affair earlier than anybody else. The letter was entered later, after the register had been started, and it was copied only as far as it touched the *Negotium Romani Imperii*. Passages not referring to this subject were omitted.[8] King Richard the Lionhearted's second letter, No.

[8] In the Register itself two omissions are indicated by the words, *et infra*, and so on. This double *et infra* is not in the text as reprinted by Migne

5 of the Register, is entirely devoted to King Otto's interests. In the Register it is dated August 18 (not 19, as Migne has) 1198. When the correspondence with Germany began and the separate Register was started, these two missives were copied among those coming from other supporters of the Guelphic candidate. This letter, No. 5, however, does not seem to have reached Rome before those of the German partisans, *i. e.,* about a month after Richard's death (April 8, 1199). Probably this very belated arrival and the fact that the writer of it was no longer living, caused the scribe, who copied it into the Register, to add the date, while otherwise, as remarked before, incoming letters are reproduced without date.

King Richard's letters are followed in the Register by communications from the Podesta of Milan (No. 6), Count Baldwin of Flanders (No. 7), and a Count of Dasburg (No. 8). The most important are a letter from Archbishop Adolph of Cologne (No. 9), and a memorial signed by five bishops, one abbot, and several secular princes. The common contents of all these communications is the recounting of the election and coronation of Otto, the definite promises he made in favor of the Church, a comparison of Otto and his ancestors with Philip and his family, the petition that the Pope recognize Otto as the real "Roman King", *i. e.,* candidate for the imperial crown, and finally the respectful request, couched in almost the same words, *ut eum ad imperialem coronationem vocare dignemini,* graciously to summon him to the imperial coronation (at Rome).

With a rather wary answer, dated May 20, 1199 (No. 11), Innocent III dismissed the solemn embassy. As stated before, the letter is not addressed to the Guelphic candidate himself, but to Otto's chief supporter, Archbishop Adolph of Cologne. To write to Otto himself might have been construed as a full recognition of his claims.

(vol. 216). The one is to be put in Col. 1000 C, after *responsione tenemur;* the other in Col. 1001 A, after *eliminare curabit.* See Peitz, in *Historisches Jahrbuch,* 1926, pp. 360-362. The reader is referred to the same author concerning the next letter.

We are agreeably touched (says the Pope) by the fact that you and many other German princes have sent to this Apostolic See our beloved sons . . . (follow the names of the envoys)[9] . . . experienced and reliable men, and have through them and through your letters informed us more fully of the manner of the election and the procedure of the coronation of our dearest son in Christ, Otto, whom you have chosen for king. You petition us to sanction your line of action, confirm it by our apostolic authority, and to summon Otto himself to the imperial coronation. Out of esteem for the Empire and on account of the devotedness, sincerity, and sterling character of Otto himself and the other princes whom the envoys represent, we received the latter graciously and as they can tell themselves entertained them munificently. We wish to state by this apostolic letter both to you and to your associates, that we shall gladly and efficaciously contribute to his honor and progress as much as we shall be able to do with the help of God, hoping that he as a Catholic prince will try to preserve and increase the devotion towards the Roman Church, which animated his ancestors, to the augmentation of his own honor.—Given at the Lateran, May 20, in the year 1199 (*Datum Laterani, XIII Kalendas Junii, Pontificatus nostri anno secundo*).

In the Register is added the notice, that his message (*in eundem fere modum,* in about the same wording) was sent to the signers of the memorial (No. 10) to each one individually, and also to very many other princes of Germany.

The letter was certainly not what had been expected when the solemn embassy left Germany for the Eternal City. In its general character the communication was non-committal. The Pope did not see that the time had come to take sides openly and officially. Otto's party was too weak to have a good prospect of success, and the Pope still hoped that the Germans would settle the dispute peacefully among themselves. In this sense he had written to Conrad the Archbishop of Mainz only two weeks earlier. Besides it seemed to him unfair to decide before he had heard from the other party. And yet Otto's party could register some gain. Though in very general terms, the Pope had promised his support, an advantage of which the opposing party could not boast. No doubt the apostolic letter did not remain without effect on the

[9] The Pope ignores the fact that these men were the envoys of Otto himself, not of the other princes. Though he shows in this letter that he strongly inclines towards the side of the Guelph, he wished to remain strictly neutral.

numerous recipients, at least on many of them, and on that part of the great and small barons of the Empire who had not yet taken sides or had done so half-heartedly. What was the party of Philip the Hohenstaufen doing meanwhile?

The next group of letters, Nos. 12-15, refer to the Hohenstaufen party. It is an almost exact parallel of the group of Nos. 3-11. The new group, too, begins with a letter from the claimant of the party, and like the first set is concluded by a reply of the Sovereign Pontiff.

Before his election, Philip, who had been excommunicated by the preceding Pope, applied to Innocent III for absolution. The Pope sent as his envoys the Bishop of Sutri and the Abbot of St. Anastasia. When these arrived, Philip had been elected by his party. The papal envoys allowed themselves to be won over by him, and to bestow the absolution, invalidly of course, without the conditions laid down by the Pope having been fulfilled. Philip retained them for a long time, until after his coronation in Mainz, and then sent them back to Rome as his own envoys with the following letter (No. 12):

To the Reverend Father and Lord in Christ, Innocent, Sovereign Pontiff of the Holy Roman Church: Philip by the grace of God King of the Romans and always Augustus—greeting and filial affection.

The messengers of your paternity, the Bishop of Sutri and the abbot of St. Anastasia, both pious and discreet men, whom you had dispatched to our presence, were kindly received by us, both out of respect for you and the Roman Church, and because of their own excellent character. And the message which they delivered to us on your behalf, we have fully and clearly understood. If we have detained these men so long and did not dismiss them to your sanctity, we desire you to know that this was not done for any other reason but that we were still waiting for the development of our affairs. We wished to send them back later, and express through them to your prudence, together with our respects, what is to the interest of Church and Empire. Through the ordinance of Divine goodness, by which we wish all our enterprises to proceed favorably, our honor has been duly augmented, the obstacles which had arisen practically cleared away, and everything seems to go according to our desire. So now after consulting with our friends and the faithful servants of our court, we send those men back to you. And trusting not without reason in their discretion we have resolved that our message should through them

be conveyed to your sanctity, praying earnestly and requesting you—*rogantes attentius et hortantes vos*—to believe their words unhesitatingly and to listen with kind sympathy as is meet—*affectuose sicut convenit*—to whatever they have to submit to you on our behalf.

This communication is indeed very different from that of Otto. Philip of Suabia does not announce his election or coronation to the Pope; does not crave the Pope's favor,[10] does not ask to be invited to Rome for the imperial coronation. Though all this may have been among the points to be communicated orally by the envoys, it would have been, to say little, by far more appropriate that the candidate of the imperial crown should express it with his own words in his epistle, as Otto of Brunswick did. Philip saw fit to disregard this appropriateness. Far from asking the Pope for advice, Philip through his envoy is going to impart some advice to Innocent as to what is conducive to the welfare of Church and Empire, and he urges the Pope "to listen to it with kind sympathy as is meet". This letter which one cannot but style arrogant, certainly did not prepossess the Pope in favor of the writer. Fr. Peitz shows that it must have been written in September, 1198, and have arrived in Rome by the end of October. The Bishop of Sutri, far from being listened to "with kind sympathy", was deposed, and went to a convent to do penance for the serious violation of his duty.

As the Guelphic party had a powerful supporter in Richard the Lionhearted, King of England, so the Hohenstaufen party looked to Philip II Augustus, King of France, for assistance. The next letter, No. 13 of the Register, probably solicited by the Germans, is from him. Unfortunately for the German Philip, the French Philip did not enjoy a good reputation at Rome. A recommendation coming from the man who contrary to repeated admonitions continued his adulterous life while he kept his true consort Ingeborg imprisoned, could not count upon a favorable

[10] It is therefore not correct if the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (vol. VIII, p. 14) says, "Philip sent the legates back with letters requesting the Pope's ratification of his election." Similar mistakes concerning the events during the first year or so after the double election are found in practically all books dealing with Innocent III. They can be corrected after Fr. Peitz's studies.

reception at the court of Innocent III. As to the restoration of rights of the Church by Philip of Suabia, the French king promised that the Hohenstaufen prince would in this matter abide by Philip Augustus's advice, in other words Philip Augustus constituted himself the arbiter between the German candidate and the Holy See:

Concerning the disputes which have been carried on between Church and Empire, the aforesaid King Philip of Germany is ready to submit to our advice and will, as regards provinces, castles, possessions, and moneys due, according to our advice conclude a permanent peace with you and the Church in order to gain your and the Church's good-will.

The Church had little to hope from the German Philip if the French Philip formed the supreme court of arbitration, however just her claims and those of the Pope might be.

As in the former group, so here also two letters of earlier date, namely those of the German and the French Philip, are entered because they served to clear up the situation and to assist the Pope in drawing up his reply. In the answer to the Guelphic party King Richard is not referred to because he had meanwhile died. Philip Augustus's missive was disregarded on account of its utter worthlessness.

During the winter of 1198-1199 the Hohenstaufen partisans drew up a memorial for the Pope, which was gradually signed by fifteen bishops, eight secular princes, and supported by *alii quam plures comites et nobiles quorum hic nomina reticemus,* "by very many counts and nobles whose names we do not mention". It was dated May 28, 1199, and must have reached Rome in the month of June. It is No. 14. It recounts the election and coronation of Philip of Suabia, and adds that his numerous adherents have pledged themselves to assist him in gaining possession of all the lands which his brother (Emperor Henry VI) had once possessed. This was a threat against the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, where young Frederic, Philip's nephew was king under Innocent III's guardianship. The rest of the letter is one continuous insult to the Pope.

Most earnestly and seriously do we, who always had the true welfare,

statum optimum, of the Roman Church at heart, beseech the clemency of your apostolic dignity not to extend your hand unjustly against the rights of the Empire, seeing that we ourselves do not permit the rights of the Church to be diminished or violated (this in the mouth of a party whose leaders were notorious for their disregard of ecclesiastical rights and possessions). Grant therefore your favor and kindness liberally to our most excellent lord, and deign to further his honor and advantage wherever you can, to the end that iniquity may not dominate over justice and truth may triumph over falsehood. We pray and beseech you moreover to yield your favor and good-will to our beloved friend, Markwald Count of Ancona and Duke of Ravenna, the faithful servant of our lord King Philip, and not to give any support to his enemies, as indeed we expect of your holiness, *sicut de vestra confidimus sanctitate.* [This Markwald was an archenemy of the Popes, had several times broken the most solemn promises and just now lay under excommunication for a similar serious transgression. The Pope is not asked to summon Philip to Rome for the coronation.] We shall soon come to Rome with all the forces in our possession, if God wills it, accompanying our lord himself to the solemn reception of the honor of imperial coronation. [And when they come, it is understood, the Pope will have to bestow the coronation at their command.]

This communication seems indeed to have been inspired by the desire to scare the Pope rather than to gain his favor. But Innocent III was not to be scared. In his dignified reply (No. 15) he sums up the demands of the princes and gives expression to his paternal grief over the existing dissension in Germany, from which he fears the gravest dangers may arise.

But there have been pestiferous characters (*homines pestilentes*) and there are still many of them, who do not want to see harmony between Church and Empire, that they may be at liberty to follow the more freely their evil inclinations; and these maintain that we wickedly labor for the weakening and humiliation of the Empire, though in reality we wish for its progress and preservation. For although some Emperors have grievously afflicted the Church, others have greatly augmented her honor. Would to God that the rights of the Church had always been so little injured as we ourselves wish the imperial rights to be unimpaired. We desire to regain and preserve our rights without infringing upon or curtailing the rights of others. And since the imperial crown is to be granted by the Roman Pontiff, the candidate having first been truly chosen and legitimately crowned king (in Germany), we shall gladly call such a prince to receive the imperial diadem, and shall confer it after the

usual preliminaries have been mutually fulfilled. But as to the affair of Markwald, we do not think that it is deserving of a reply. . . . [The Pope here enumerates some of this man's crimes against the Church and other rulers. He concludes,] As successors of St. Peter we shall zealously endeavor to carry out everything which will contribute to the glory of the Divine Name, the honor of the Apostolic See, the greatness of the imperial position, and the welfare of soul and body.

This important letter was issued about August 1, 1199. With it ends the set of letters which it was proposed to review in this article. These communications, divided into two groups, each one of which is capped by a papal answer, cover an important period of nearly a year and a half. Fr. Peitz's searching studies on the *Registrum de Negotio Romani Imperii,* in particular the more exact dating of many of the letters, have thrown new light upon this period and done away with many errors entertained concerning them by friends and foes of the papacy.

It can no longer be maintained that Innocent III was eager to interfere with the German party strife, in order to set forth clearly the relations between Empire and Church. Had this been the case, the letter of Richard the Lionhearted, No. 4 of the *Regestum,* which must have reached Rome in the summer of 1198, would have offered a pretext for drawing the matter before the papal forum. At any rate, the Pope would have had a good chance, after a communication from the other side, the letter of Philip the Hohenstaufen, No. 12, had arrived in October of the same year. The date of the beginning of the *Registrum* is also the date of the beginning of the papal interference. Innocent III waited until at least one of the two parties had formally notified him of the steps it had taken. Diplomatically it was the right moment. Nobody could charge him with unauthorized meddling in German affairs, after the Germans themselves appealed to him. (Philip himself, as noted before, had not asked for his support.) The Popes have never interfered with the elections of German kings, and Innocent III did not mean to be an exception to the rule. Hence his admonitions to the Germans to come to an understanding (No. 2), and to Archbishop Conrad (No. 1). He reserved, however, to himself the judgment whether

or not the king presented to him for the imperial coronation was possessed of those qualities required in a true emperor as the future protector of Pope and Church.

Nor did the Pope, as some want it, immediately after the double election order the letters referring to the crown dispute to be entered into a special record book, which was to receive the transcripts as the letters arrived, "week after week". The first letter copied into the book was dated May 3, 1199, when the civil dissension with its accompanying evils had lasted about a year. Chronological order has not been aimed at in the entries of these first groups nor in those of the rest of the collection.

Nor is it correct to assert that both parties "almost immediately" had recourse to the Pope, a statement frequently found in Catholic and non-Catholic publications, and briefly referred to before. Philip had been elected on March 8, 1198; he addressed his first communication to Rome after his coronation in September; and the joint letter of his party was dated May 26, 1199. Of the election and coronation of Otto the Pope received an intimation by the letter of Richard the Lionhearted in the summer of 1198, but this did not proceed from the claimant himself or his party. The letters of the Guelphic candidate and his followers must have arrived in Rome shortly before May, 1199, *i. e.,* nearly a year after Otto's election and coronation.

Frequently the charge is made, and it is indeed a terrible accusation, that Innocent III advisedly and planfully endeavored to prolong the disastrous dissension in Germany. With the information gleaned from fifteen letters it is of course impossible to refute this charge peremptorily and finally. But certainly the closest examination of these fifteen communications, in particular the letters of the Pope himself, will not reveal the slightest indication of so criminal an intention. A man who writes letters such as these four cannot have been bent on perpetuating the sad state of disorder then existing in Germany. As far as these letters reach, and they cover about a year after the beginning of the crown dispute, there is no foundation for that indictment. They make it utterly unlikely, too, that the Pope's mind should later

on have conceived so horrible a design. Not without the strongest and completely irrefragable arguments will genuine historians permit themselves to fasten on Innocent III the wilful responsibility for the bloody civil war in Germany. Some further considerations concerning this accusation are given below in Appendix II, in connection with the latest publication on this great Pope.

A brief summary of the later development of affairs may be in place. After many futile attempts to bring about unity among the Germans, Innocent III, on March 1, 1201, recognized Otto as Roman King or candidate for the Imperial Crown. Otto's party increased rapidly. But he lost very many of his new and old followers by his haughtiness and stinginess, while Philip's party increased. Philip had made some overtures to the Pope and was absolved from the excommunication, when, in 1208, he was killed by one of his own supporters on account of an entirely private dissension. Otto became generally recognized. In 1209 he received the Imperial Crown in Rome, and at once became the determined foe of Pope and Papacy breaking all his solemnly sworn pledges. "No instance of a more glaring ingratitude", says the Protestant historian Fred. Boehmer, "is known to history." After practicing much forbearance Innocent III excommunicated him; his German followers one by one abandoned his cause; and a last attempt to regain his prestige as ally of King John Lackland of England was frustrated by Philip II Augustus of France in the battle of Bouvines in 1214. Otto withdrew from public life and died repentant in 1218. Meanwhile the Germans elected a second time Frederick, son of Henry VI, now King of the Two Sicilies, who with the assistance of Innocent III came into possession of power, was duly crowned at Aachen, and received the Imperial Crown from Innocent's successor Honorius III. The future was to show that this Hohenstaufen prince was as ungrateful as Otto the Guelph had been, and brought greater evils upon Pope and Church than Otto had had a chance to inflict. This treacherous policy of Frederic II was an indirect justification of the distrust with which Innocent had viewed the candidacy of his uncle Philip of Suabia.

Appendix I

In how far the current representation of the life of Innocent III needs revision we cannot here decide. But his attitude towards the German crown dispute in its initial stages has been put into a different light by Father Peitz's researches on the first fifteen numbers of the *Registrum de Negotio Imperii Romani.* A chronological table of these letters and the events covered by them may be found useful.

1197. September 28, Death of Emperor Henry VI.
1198, January 8, Election of Pope Innocent III.
March 8, Election of Henry VI's brother Philip of Suabia.
June 8, Election of Otto of Brunswick.
July 12, Coronation of Otto at Aachen.
July, First letter of Richard the Lionhearted in favor of Otto (No. 4).
August 18, Second letter of Richard (surrendered the following spring), (No. 5).
September 8, Philip again elected and crowned at Mainz.
September, Letter of Philip of Suabia to the Pope (No. 12).
1199, February, Letter of Philip II Augustus of France in favor of Philip of Suabia (No. 13).
March or April (before April 6) letter of Otto to the Pope (No. 3).
April 6, Death of Richard the Lionhearted.
During spring, Several letters of German adherents of Otto (Nos. 6, 7, 8, among them one from Archbishop Adolph of Cologne (No. 9).
April, Common letter of German princes announcing Otto's election etc. (No. 10).
April, Resolution of Innocent III to begin a special Register of the communications referring to the affair of the double election.
May 3, Innocent III's letter to Archbishop Conrad of Mainz (No. 1).
About the same time, Innocent's letter to the German princes exhorting them to unity (No. 2).
May 20, Reply of Innocent III to the Party of Otto, addressed to Adolph, Archbishop of Cologne (No. 11).

May 26, Date of letter of Philip's party to the Pope (No. 14).
About August 1, Reply of Innocent III to the princes of Philip's party (No. 15).

Appendix II

A charge made repeatedly against Innocent III is that he planfully worked for the prolongation of the German civil war, which it is said enabled him to pursue his other schemes without having to fear the counteraction of an Emperor. This horrible indictment is repeated forcibly by Packard, in his *Europe and the Church under Innocent III* [1] p. 31: "The greatest Pope of the Middle Ages chained the Empire to the disorder of a disputed election for a full decade. . . ." Though this author repeats this charge several times, we do not see that he attempts to prove it. He never points to any word or action of Innocent as confirming his accusation. Indeed if Innocent did not decide sooner in the double election, if he dismissed Otto's embassy with general promises, and repelled the insults of Philip's party without promising anything, it was because it would have been positively imprudent to act differently. He had to figure with actual conditions of the time, and could not go by ideas which some writers of the twentieth century would entertain of his course of action. But could he not have at once recognized Philip of Suabia? Decidedly not. First, Otto's adherence, though smaller than that of Philip, was by no means negligible, and could have made an efficient government by Philip impossible. Second, seeing what sentiments Philip and his party showed by their utterances, and what had been the practice and tradition of his family during half a century, it would

[1] Packard, Sidney R., *Europe and the Church under Innocent III.* It is a little book of about a hundred pages, belonging to the *Berkshire Studies in European History,* published by Henry Holt, and like the other publications of this series is destined to serve as additional reading for history classes. Unfortunately it is full of inaccuracies and assertions that are worse. The accusation against Innocent III here under consideration is only one instance. See *Historical Bulletin,* vol. VII (1928-9), p. 64.

have been foolhardy to decide for him, and thus conjure up for the Church and Italy, and let us add for the Christian world, the days of Barbarossa and Henry VI.

It is interesting to notice that Dr. Packard does not trust any too much the justice of the accusation he worded so strongly and repeated several times. On p. 44 he says, "Whether or not Innocent III created or prolonged the peculiar conditions (in Germany) . . . may well be argued." He thinks, however, that whether the German civil war was caused or perpetuated by the Pope or not, "the dependence of his good fortune as Pope and as temporal ruler of Europe upon a disunited Germany is certainly beyond dispute". We beg to differ. In many of his letters, in No. 15 for instance, the Pope states that he wants an emperor for the protection of the Church, because "though some Emperors have grievously afflicted the Church, others have greatly augmented her honor". And indeed, how much more efficiently could the Pope have ruled, had there been an Emperor who was conscious of his duties towards all parties concerned, such an Emperor as Lothair (1125-1137), who equally promoted the prestige of the Empire and the interests of the Church. Innocent's far-reaching activity would have been much more successful had there been a true Emperor at the head of the Christian commonwealth. One of the chief reasons why Innocent III deplored the chaotic state of Germany and the absence of an Emperor was his dominant idea of a recovery of the Holy Land and the general defence of the boundaries of Christianity. He desires to see a Roman Emperor at the head of crusading armies.

As a fitting conclusion let us see how Fr. Emil Michael, S. J., answers the question on whom the guilt of the terrible woe which came upon Germany is to be laid. In his *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes,* Vol. VI, pp. 115-117, he says:

The Pope was without guilt in the whole matter, although even short-sighted and impassionate contemporaries raised against him the most unqualified reproaches. Whoever looks at things without prejudice must perceive that the Pope did what he could do to terminate the quarrel. With those who *a-priori* and one-sidedly place themselves upon the stand-

point of the Hohenstaufen party and maintain that Innocent III should have recognized Philip under any condition, a fair discussion is impossible. When each of the two rivals demanded the imperial crown, Innocent was obliged to decide for him who offered the better guaranty that he would conscientiously fulfil his duties as Emperor. An unprejudiced survey of the situation must show, that as things stood, Innocent III could not give his support to the excommunicated Hohenstaufen prince. Philip's own transgressions and those of his family spoke too peremptorily against him, while Otto of Brunswick seemed to have many points in his favor. Since Innocent could not put up a third candidate, nothing was left but to decide for Otto.

Of decisive importance was the respectful manner in which the Guelph turned to the Holy See, and on the other hand the cold and haughty communications which came from Philip (and his party). It was disastrous both for him and for Germany that he was so rich, so powerful, and therefore too proud to receive as it were the royal dignity from Rome, when as he thought, he could have it without Rome through his own power.

Yet Philip himself was by no means the principal culprit. On his side were many and very influential bishops. Among these were not lacking those whose sentiments were by no means in harmony with their sacred calling, and who harbored downright hostility against the Holy See.[2] Such prelates were Conrad, Bishop of Hildesheim, who served Philip of Suabia as chancellor and during many years exerted a very evil influence upon him, Conrad, Bishop of Speyer, Luitpold of Worms. It was only too natural that these men, surrounded by the halo of high spiritual dignity, exercised a magic influence upon the youthful layman Philip, especially when they seemed to advance his own interest. It must be ascribed to ecclesiastics like these that Philip for years remained disaffected towards the Roman Pontiff, and addressed letters to him the tone of which, even from the standpoint of calculating policy, was far from conciliating.

But all the power and riches of Philip were unable to dispel the unfavorable impression which the Pope had necessarily received concerning the Hohenstaufen candidate. Innocent III was in too high degree a champion of right to be swayed by power or defiance. . . .

The impartial historian's verdict must be: the responsibility for the many years of terrible civil war in Germany lies with the influential personages in the entourage of the Hohenstaufen prince.

FRANCIS S. BETTEN, S. J.

[2] At this time many of the bishoprics were held by men who had been intruded by Barbarossa and Henry VI in open violation of the Concordat of Worms.

DID A PRIEST ACCOMPANY COLUMBUS IN 1492?

Whether any priest went with Columbus upon his first voyage to the Indies is still an undetermined question and a particularly interesting one since the character of the man leads us to believe that he would not depart on what he expected to be a long journey without a chaplain, while the fairly complete documentation of the first voyage fails to discover any proof of a priest as a member of the expedition. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries many writers, particularly those belonging to the Franciscan and Mercedarian orders, assumed without question that some priest accompanied Columbus and celebrated, consequently, the first Mass in the Indies either on the island of San Salvador, October 12, 1492, or a little later on the island of Española, or Haiti. For these writers, it was not the presence of a priest but merely his identity that needed to be established.

The Ilustrísimo Padre Gonzaga, general of the Franciscans, towards the end of the sixteenth century wrote a chronicle [1] of his order, based upon letters [2] sent to him at his request by the superiors of all the provinces, among them the province of the Holy Cross, located at Santo Domingo. In summarizing the report of this province, Gonzaga wrote:

> When Columbus took possession of the island [Española], having come safely to his journey's end, our religious, among whom was Fray Juan Pérez, began the foundation of the province of the Holy Cross . . . and Fray Juan Pérez, who, as has been said, was the first to enter the island, undertook the building of a hut or oratory of boughs, in which was celebrated the first Mass and the Blessed Sacrament first reserved. This was the first church in the Indies.

In the original, the phrase that has been translated above, "having come safely to his journey's end" reads "ad eas partes secunda

[1] *De Origine Seraphicae Religionis Franciscanae*, Rome, 1587, p. 1198. See *Coll.*, P. Fr. José, *Colón y La Rábida*, Madrid, 1892, chapter XXX *passim*.

[2] Caulin, P. Fr. Antonio, *Historia de la Nueva Andalucía*, Madrid, 1779, bk. II, chap. I, fol. 113.

navigatione trajecere". "Secunda" here has been interpreted both as "safe" and as "second." Those authors who translated it "safe or prosperous" cited frequent use of it in this sense, especially in speaking of sea voyages. Tacitus, for instance, so uses it.[3] This interpretation is supported by the following line of the quotation: "Fray Juan Pérez was the first to enter the island." If, on the contrary, "secunda navigatione" referred to the second expedition, Juan Pérez would not have been in charge of the erection of the first altar, nor would he have had the honor of celebrating the first Mass, because there was on the second expedition a vicar apostolic chosen by Ferdinand and appointed by Pope Alexander VI, Fray Bernal Boyl.[4] Father Boyl had been a Benedictine at the monastery of Montserrat where Ferdinand had met him, but about a year before the discovery of America he had joined the stricter order of the Minims, and at the time of his appointment to Española was the vicar general of that order in Spain. By canon law the vicar apostolic would have performed the offices ascribed by Gonzaga to Juan Pérez. Therefore, if there is any fact in the above story, Pérez sailed on the first and not on the second expedition.

Gonzaga himself gave no authority for any of his statements, but the Padre Fray Antonio Caulin,[5] writing towards the eighteenth century gave the following interesting note, which, could it be verified, would settle all doubt on the subject. "The archives of the province of the Holy Cross on the island of Española affirm the story of Fray Juan Pérez, and it was taken from them more than a hundred and seventy years ago and sent to the Reverend Father Gonzaga who placed it in his chronicle; likewise, it was affirmed by the provincial, the Reverend Father Villanueva."

Father Villanueva was provincial in 1752, and sent the information evidently referred to by Caulin to the Franciscan chron-

[3] *Annales*, Lib. ii, 8.

[4] "The First Vicar Apostolic in the Indies," *Ecclesiastical Review*, January, 1930.

[5] Caulin, *op. cit.*, fol. 114.

icler Padre Fray José Torrubia,[6] who in turn repeated it on Father Villanueva's authority. In the dedication to a book of his own sermons,[7] Father Villanueva said: "I saw that our founder came with the discoverer Don Christopher Columbus, and how it was clear from our provincial archives that the founder of this province was the Padre Fray Juan Pérez de Marchena, who in 1492 was Guardian of the Monastery of La Rábida. He built the first church in Española at Navidad, and was the first to celebrate Mass in it."

Later Franciscan authors[8] have copied this story from Gonzaga, some claiming that Juan Pérez was on the first voyage and some that he was on the second. None of them shows any historical grounds except Caulin who, as we have seen, claimed that Gonzaga and Villanueva had used the archives of the province, a claim repeated by the latter himself. This would be convincing if Columbus made any mention of Pérez in his Journal, but he does not, nor does Ferdinand Columbus in his biography of his father, nor Las Casas nor any other of the early chroniclers. Moreover the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament in a hut such as described is contrary to the canons of the Church on the care due to the Blessed Sacrament, and also to the early American custom. The King writing November, 1509, to the Casa de Contratación, that is to the House of Trade at Seville in charge of the business of the Indies, said: "Hurry to send master mechanics and material for the churches. There is not one of stone, I believe. There is thus no way of reserving the Blessed Sacrament, and consequently many die without Holy Viaticum."[9]

[6] *Crónica Seráfica*, Rome, 1756, part IX, bk. I, chap. X, no. 68.

[7] Villanueva, Bartolomé, *Sermones de María Santísima*, Sevilla, 1752.

[8] Olmo, P. Fr. Juan de, *Arbol Seráfico*, Barcelona, 1703; Wadingo, P. Lucas, Rome, 1731, Año 1493; P. Francis Harold of Limerick, *Epitome Annalium Ordinis Minorum*, Rome, 1662, año 1493; Fr. Arthur, *Martirologium Franciscanum*, Paris, 1653, 31 de agosto; Diego de Córdoba, *Crónica de la Provincia del Perú*, Lima, 1651; Simón, Fr. Pedro, *Noticias historiales de Tierrafirme*, Cuenca, 1627; Daza, P. Fr. Antonio, *Crónica General de la Orden de San Francisco*, Valladolid, 1611.

[9] *Colección de documentos inéditos . . . del real archivo de las Indias*, 2nd series, vol. V, pp. 188-189.

The Mercedarians have less on which to base their contention that a friar of their order sailed as chaplain on the first voyage. The earliest Mercedarian chronicle that mentions Española is the *Historia General de la Orden de Nuestra Señora de la Merced,* published in 1639, written by Fray Alonso de Remón. In this chronicle we read that Juan de Solórzano a native of Aguilar del Campo was sent as confessor to Columbus on the first voyage, at the latter's request made to the general of the order, Fray Juan de Urge. Other Mercedarians have followed Remón, but nowhere is there any authority given for their contention. The presence of a Mercedarian is based chiefly on a paragraph written by Peter Martyr of Angleria [10] in his Decades of the New World. It is the story of the arrival of Columbus on the island of Española "where he disembarked in order to get water and wood". While they were cutting wood and filling the ship, "one of the archers went into the forest to hunt. There a man dressed in a white tunic suddenly appeared, and at first glance the archer believed it was the friar of the order of Our Lady of Mercy [Mercedarian] whom the admiral had with him as chaplain, but at the next moment two others came out from behind the trees." Whatever apparition—whether mammoth storks, as Irving suggests, or some other manifestation of nature—startled the archer, he referred, according to the Decades, with certainty to a chaplain, to the color of his habit, and to his religious affiliation. It is reasonable to expect to find truth in the Decades, for Peter Martyr wrote them in 1523, choosing for them, he said, parts of letters written by Columbus, whose friend he was. He was also counsellor to Ferdinand and Isabella, and, during the time when he was writing the Decades, he was living at the court of Granada where he could consult all the letters to the crown from the officials of the Indies. Father Pedro Nolasco Pérez, in his history of the Mercedarians published in 1923, says he believes that Columbus had as chaplain Solórzano or some other member of the order, but that in a long and thorough search of archives in Spain he had not

[10] *De orbe novo decades,* Dec. I, chap. III, folio 7, 9, verso.

been able to find trace of a document to substantiate the claim.[11]

From still another quarter, founded, perhaps, on better sources, comes the assertion that a secular priest, Father Pedro de Arenas, accompanied Columbus on his first voyage. Vignaud[12] in his critical studies of the life of Columbus cites an ancient manuscript of the National Library in Madrid,[13] in which it was written that Pedro de Arenas, a priest who had come to know Columbus in La Vega de Granada, went with him on his first voyage. This manuscript Father Fidel Fita published in the *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia,*[14] having had his attention directed to it by the Indice de manuscritos de la Biblioteca Nacional which was printed as an appendix to volume II of the *Ensayo de una biblioteca española de libros raros y curiosos.* In the Indice there was this heading:

"Arenas (Pedro de) native of Villatobas. Facts of his life and of how he was the first priest who celebrated Mass in the New World, having accompanied Columbus." (J 34, p. 131.) Father Fidel Fita discovered the manuscript in the codex J 34, but on pages 191 and 192. It was written, apparently to a Jesuit, Padre Juan de Arenas Arinero y Montalvo, a member of the illustrious Arenas family of Villatobas, who was gathering information about the family. It is signed by a Doctor Sebastian Agraz and dated Villatobas, January 13, 1648.

Doctor Agraz wrote "In answer to the request of your Reverence I should like to write you complete information, but I have not found any more on this matter in the history of the Arenas family which is, if your memory serves you well, a very old and defective manuscript, as is not surprising, since it seems to have been written in 1520 by the Licentiate Juan Arinero y Montalvo."

[11] *Religiosos de la Merced que pasaron a la América española,* Seville, 1923. Part I, pp. 17-19.

[12] Vignaud, H., *Histoire critique de la grande entreprise de Christophe Colomb,* 2 vols., Paris, 1911. Vol. II, p. 166.

[13] *Bibliografía Columbina,* Madrid, 1892, p. 342, no. 198.

[14] Vol. 18, pp. 551-554. Father Fidel Fita, S. J. (1835-1917), distinguished historian, director for some years of Real Academia de la Historia.

Then Agraz gave the information he had gathered from the manuscript history.

In 1479,[15] when Sixtus IV [16] granted a jubilee, there left this villa of Villatobas, Pedro de Arenas, a student of about twenty years of age, son of honorable and distinguished parents, to go to Rome to gain the jubilee, to visit the tomb of the apostles, and kiss the foot of His Holiness. He finished his studies in theology, and was ordained priest in the time of Innocent VIII [1484-92], and with the papal benediction he left Rome to come to Spain. However, when he reached Genoa, he settled in a little town near the city and became pastor in a church of his patron St. Peter. The church flourished so during his pastorate that it began to be called St. Peter of Arenas. While in Genoa, he met Christopher Columbus who was in that city trying to interest the Republic in his ideas. Finally, after some years, Father Pedro de Arenas decided to come to Spain to Villatobas. There he found that his parents had died. Although there still survived three other members of his immediate family and a number of other relatives, he did not remain in Villatobas, as it seemed to him too small a field for his generous ambitions. He went to Andalusia to see the Catholic Sovereigns who were at that time engaged in the conquest of Granada; he found them in Santa Fe where he perhaps also met his great friend Christopher Columbus, then occupied in completing the details for his voyage of exploration, business which he concluded with the help of a Franciscan Guardian, his great friend. When the Franciscan left for his convent, the Licentiate Arenas remained with Columbus, and after witnessing the entrance of the sovereigns into Granada, decided to go with him to Palos, because of their friendship and the affection that both had for Genoa. Columbus asked Father Arenas to go with him as confessor for those setting out on the new undertaking. He accepted the invitation, and after undergoing with the others incredible labor in the service of mankind finally reached the island of the Lucayos called San Salvador where he said the first Mass, and built an altar to God, thus spreading knowledge of His Name in lands so distant from ours. Columbus had to return to Spain to report to the sovereigns, but he begged Arenas to remain in Española for the consolation of the people who were staying to make the settlement at Navidad. Columbus carried letters to the family of Father Arenas, in which we find the above information.

---

[15] Father Fidel Fita explains that 1479 = 1475; that the number *5* is easily mistaken for *9* in old manuscripts.

[16] The jubilee was granted by Paul II but executed by his successor Sixtus IV.

The history says no more about Pedro de Arenas, he must have died in the service of the Armada, overcome by labor suffered in God's service.

Father Fidel Fita published this document in 1889, and stated that he hoped to further an investigation into the reliability of its contents. D. Cesáreo Fernando Duro, member of the Royal Academy of History, vouched for the existence of a parish church in Genoa in 1640 that bore the name of Saint Peter de Arenas, and Father Fidel Fita, with the help of an eminent archaeologist, D. Fernando Arenas, a member of the same family of Villatobas, hoped to verify other details of the story; but, doubtless, the old manuscript which the letter of Doctor Agraz gave as his source, has been lost or destroyed, and there remains no way of forming a judgment of its value. Like the statement of Villanueva's that he himself found in the Franciscan archives of Santo Domingo the story that Pérez was chaplain on this voyage, like Caulin's assertion that Gonzaga read the same story, and like Peter Martyr's casual mention of the Mercedarian on the voyage, this claim by Doctor Agraz that he read his story in a history written by a member of the family of Father de Arenas, and based upon the Father's own letters, carried by Columbus from Navidad to Villatobas, seems worthy of consideration and respect. But, on the other hand, we have the compelling, even though negative, evidence already cited, namely, the complete absence of any reference to a priest on the first voyage in the manuscript of Columbus, and consequently in the writings of his son Ferdinand, of Las Casas, and of Oviedo, whose information about this voyage was derived almost entirely from the letters and reports of the discoverer. This is the more significant because Columbus mentioned so many of his companions that it is difficult to believe that he should have failed to record his chaplain's existence or name. From the writings of the explorer and of his son, pieced out by evidence given in law suits, and by treasury accounts, a fairly satisfactory list has been constructed of these who were members of this expedition, and of the group who remained to make a settlement at Navidad on the north coast of Española. Among all these, there is no evidence that any name represents a priest. However, as we shall see, the

list is not a complete one, and it is conceivable, even though improbable, that among the missing names may be that of a chaplain. The only basis for a conjecture lies in the extant documents and the total number of men for whom they account.

The number of those who formed the first expedition has been variously given. Ferdinand Columbus and Las Casas placed it at 90, Oviedo at 120, Peter Martyr at 220, and Diego Columbus at 68.[17] Modern historians have, for the most part, accepted either 120 or 90. The Spanish Archaeological Commission, created as part of the honor of the Columbus celebration of 1892, reconciled the figure of Ferdinand Columbus and Las Casas with that of Oviedo by the hypotheses that ninety men formed the personnel of the expedition and that with these went thirty others, servants, etc.[18] Vignaud agrees to the former figure but doubts that they carried more than twenty supernumeraries. According to the present general acceptance, then, either 120 or 110 people are to be accounted for, and we have a list of 108, taken, as we shall see, from first hand sources, which, barring human propensity to error, ought to be unquestionable. Thirty-seven names come from a list belonging to Columbus.[19] Before he sailed in 1492, he had a notary in Palos make an itemized account of the payments disbursed. Then he had a duplicate made for himself. The former has been lost but part of the latter was found intact in his personal archives in the monastery of Las Cuevas in Seville. Of the thirty-seven names on it, nine repeated names found elsewhere while twenty-eight were a new contribution to the total. The remaining seventy-one names on the list of one hundred and eight

[17] References following Vignaud, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 162. F. Colón, chap. XV, fol. 38 recto; Las Casas, Bartolomé, *Historia General de las Indias*, bk. I, chap. XXXIV; Oviedo y Valdés, Gonzalo Fernandez de, *Historia general y natural de las Indias*, Madrid, 1851, bk. II, chap. V; Peter Martyr, *op. cit.*, Dec. I, ch. I; Diego Colón, *Relación del pleito del Estado de Veragua hecha por el almirante D. Diego Colón. Nuevos Autógrafos de la duquesa de Alba*, pp. 36-37.

[18] Vignaud, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 162.

[19] Rol o relación de la gente que fué con Cristobal Colón en el primer viaje, *Nuevos Autógrafos de la duquesa de Alba*, pp. 7-10.

were compiled from the following main sources: first, from Columbus's Journal on board ship; second, from the evidence he laid before the crown in the suit he waged for the restoration of his rights as granted in the Articles of Capitulation; third, from evidence pronounced in court in 1552 by the heirs of the family of Niño de Moguer, several members of which sailed with Columbus; fourth, from the "Libros de cuenta y razon," an account book found in the Archives of the Indies, showing amounts paid from 1503 to 1515 to widows and relatives of those who died in the Indies.[20] Each one of these four sources duplicates some of the names on one or more of the other three, while Oviedo, Las Casas, Herrena, and other early writers, in turn, give the names of many; thus, taking everything into consideration, it may be said that these men are as certainly identified as is possible in a list made partly on the basis of their function in the expedition and partly on that the cities or towns from which they came.

We are also interested in the number left at Navidad because of the claim made by Agraz that Father de Arenas remained with those whom Columbus left to make this settlement. Fernando Columbus gave the number as 36, Las Casas as 39, Peter Martyr and Oviedo as 38, and the "Libros de cuenta y razon" as 37.[21] Navarette in his history of the voyages of Columbus published in 1825,[22] gave a "list of the persons whom Columbus left in Española, who were dead when he returned". He stated that he took the list from the Muñoz collection of papers in the Archives of the Indies and that it represented a list used by the Casa de Contratación in sending for heirs to come to receive money due them. It was found, however, upon examination that this manuscript discovered by Muñoz lacked names that, according to Columbus in his Journal and to Las Casas, should have been included, that it gave forty names even while stating that only thirty-seven

[20] Vignaud, *op. cit.*, vol. II, pp. 526-532. Also in Thatcher, J. Boyd, *Christopher Columbus*, vol. I, pp. 470-471; Harrisse, Henry, *The Discovery*, pp. 662-666, and elsewhere.

[21] Following Vignaud, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 164; F. Colón, ch. XXXIII, fol. 70 verso; Las Casas, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 413 and vol. II, p. 12; Peter Martyr, Letter CXXXIII, p. 4 in Gaffarel edition; Oviedo, *op. cit.*, bk. II, chap. VI.

[22] *Viajes*, vol. II, No. XIII, p. 18.

remained at Navidad, and that names of the men it contained were not found among those in the sources listed above. It has been concluded that this list of Nuñoz's is of some who died in the Indies, perhaps on the second expedition.[23] However, the "Libros de cuenta y razón" specifically identifies a third of those who remained at Navidad by placing against thirteen names in its list the notation "who died in Española among those whom they found dead in Española".

From other sources,[24] we can add, with confidence four more names, thus identifying the names of seventeen of these thirty-seven settlers, and leaving without such identification twenty. The complete list of one hundred and eight probably contains these twenty names; it can lack but two if Vignaud is right in saying only 110 sailed, while the maximum of possible omissions is twelve if we follow the figure of Oviedo.

Thus the possibility of the presence of a chaplain is reduced to the extraordinary coincidence of his name's being one of the two (or twelve) omitted and of an inexplicable failure of Columbus to mention him. The weight of evidence is that no priest sailed on this first voyage.

Historians who have taken up this question of a chaplain, Winsor, for instance, and Washington Irving, and Vignaud agree that there seems to have been no priest, and that this is surprising considering the piety of the man, and the religious character he himself attributed to his enterprise. Vignaud cites P. Fr. Alonso Remón as giving, after long and careful researches on the point, good reasons for the belief that a priest accompanied Columbus on this voyage.[25] Father Remón wrote no more than this: "It seems improbable that Columbus did not have a priest to say Mass and to hear the confessions of the members of the expeditions." If we consider the situation carefully it does not seem so improbable. Columbus, modern scholars claim, set out to discover certain islands whose existence he suspected, and he expected to find

[23] Vignaud, *op. cit.*, vol. II, pp. 165-166.
[24] *Ibid.*, note p. 166.
[25] *Ibid.*, note p. 167. Vignaud's reference to Remón ought to read vol. II, fol. 89 instead of vol. I, fol. 90.

these islands somewhat nearer to Spain than they were.[26] Thus, he must have reasoned that he would be gone less than six months. Before he sailed, according to Herrera,[27] the entire party went to Confession and received Holy Communion. They left in August and would be back, probably, before Lent. It was the rule in that century, rather than the exception, to go to Confession but once or twice a year, and as to the last sacraments, men like Columbus and his sailors, set sail with expectation of a happy return. Moreover, not even on board ships that carried a chaplain was Mass said, because of the smallness of the boats, the roughness of the seas, and the consequent insecurity of any altar erected on deck. Magellan had three or more priests on his expedition; Sarmiento, later in the sixteenth century on his voyage of discovery of the Straits of Magellan had two; Azurara, earlier in the fifteenth century in his explorations of the coast of Africa had at least one, but none of the journals of these voyages speaks of Mass on board ship. Whenever and wherever they disembarked, Mass was celebrated, but not on board ship. Now if Columbus had thought from the beginning of leaving such a settlement as Navidad to hold the islands he hoped to find, it is indeed singular that he should not have provided for its spiritual needs; but if he had no such plan, he was sailing as many before and many after him sailed, Vasco de Gama, for instance, and John of Betancour on his first voyage to the Canary islands, and Americus Vespucius, Juan de Solís, and, in fact, most of the Spaniards who followed Columbus on voyages of exploration.

When they came to settle, then they had priests with them for their own needs and for the work of conversion of the natives. Thus John of Betancour on his second voyage to the Canaries, and thus Columbus on his second voyage to the Indies, but as the first voyage was clearly not one for settlement, there is no reason for hesitating to accept the evidence of Columbus's own report that he had no priest.

E. Ward Loughran.

[26] Vignaud, *op. cit.*, vol. II, pp. 395-398.

[27] Herrera y Tordesillas, Antonio de, *Historia general*, Madrid, 1601, Dec. I. bk. I, chap. IX.

MISCELLANY

THE CELTIC LITURGIES HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED

I. *Preliminary Notions.* The liturgies which we have briefly to describe are those which were in use in those parts of the British Isles which were inhabited (and are still, to a great extent) by populations Celtic in origin, and speaking a Celtic tongue. These are divided, according to their peculiarities of idiom, into two main groups: the Brythonic, consisting of the inhabitants of Wales, Cornwall, and Brittany; and the Gaelic, composed of the Gaelic population, not only of Ireland, but of the Scotland of to-day. In the early Middle Ages the Irish were called in Latin, *Scotti.*

It is well known that the form of Christianity established in these countries had long been distinguished by peculiarities of discipline, for example, in such matters as the date of Easter, the mode of wearing the tonsure, etc., as well as by a somewhat special ecclesiastical organization of which a predominance of the monastic element and the great number of non-diocesan bishops were features. The religious temperament of these races, their forms of piety, and their ascetical culture also present characteristics of a striking kind. The liturgies followed in these islands were, in certain respects, sufficiently different from the other Latin liturgies of the West as to justify separate treatment. None the less, it was only in the nineteenth century—and towards its end—that people began to speak of a "Celtic Liturgy". Mabillon was concerned only with an Irish Liturgy (*Liturgia Hibernia*). As a matter of fact, it is about the Irish rites that we know most.

However, since the publication of F. E. Warren's *The Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church* (Oxford, 1881), which, though now out of date, marked a stage in this department of liturgical study, it has come to be recognized that this denomination was too narrow, and the wider expression "Celtic Liturgy" has been preferred.

In 1908, Mr. Henry Jenner entitled his important article in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* "The Celtic Rite". In 1910, we ourselves wrote for the *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie,* edited by Dom Cabrol and H. Leclercq (t. II, 2d. part, cols. 2969-3032), an article which we called, in the plural, "Celtic Liturgies"

(to this, when necessary, we shall refer as *Lit. Celt.*). For it is not the case that, throughout the Middle Ages, the liturgy of the Celtic churches was one and the same. These churches sustained various external influences. We may say that, to a large extent, they developed separately, adopting, at different periods, the Roman date for Easter, and form of tonsure. Gradually, with their special form of discipline, these countries lost their liturgical peculiarities: Brittany from the time of Louis the Pious (817); Scotland, probably, from the eleventh century, through the zeal of its queen, St. Margaret. In the twelfth century the Roman liturgy was introduced into Ireland by St. Malachy, Archbishop of Armagh, St. Bernard's friend. Immediately after the English conquest, the Synod of Cashel (1172) directed all the churches of Ireland to adopt the Anglo-Roman rite. For these reasons we prefer to speak of "Celtic liturgies", rather than of the "Celtic liturgy".

II. *Sources.* In *Lit. Celt.* (cols. 2971-2988) we have given a list of sources to be used in the study of Celtic liturgies, to which we must refer the reader for fuller information, since we cannot go into the matter in great detail here. We must content ourselves with pointing out the principal sources alone.

The two chief liturgical books, the Bangor Antiphonary and the Stowe Missal, are of monastic origin.

The Bangor Antiphonary is a collection of canticles, hymns, collects, antiphons, and versicles which must have been intended for the use of the abbot of the famous monastery of Bangor, in Ireland, founded by St. Comgall, where St. Columban underwent his religious formation. The composition of this book must be put between 680 and 691.

The Stowe Missal, which is the work of several scribes, was probably composed for the Abbey of Tallaght, near Dublin, in the first decade of the tenth century. This manuscript was not found on the Continent, as has been believed; probably it never left the British Isles.[1] After having been, for several years, the property of the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, to whom Stowe House, Buckinghamshire, belonged, and then of the Earl of Ashburnham, it has belonged since 1883 to the library of the Royal Irish Academy in Dublin (MS. D. II. 3). The best edition is that of G. F. Warner (Henry Bradshaw Society, 2 vols.: 1st. vol., 1906, Facsimile; 2d. vol., 1915, Text).

[1] See T. F. O'Rahilly's paper mentioned in the Bibliography.

Besides numerous liturgical fragments discovered in manuscripts of Irish origin, special mention must also be made of two collections of hymns in Latin and Irish, preserved in Dublin and published, like the book last mentioned and the Bangor Antiphonary, by the same Henry Bradshaw Society of London.

III. *Origins.* We are only very imperfectly informed as to what was the process of formation of the liturgies peculiar to these islands. Nor do we know much more about the dates at which those continental influences which evidently affected them prevailed. An anonymous treatise of the eighth century, which professes to give an account of the origin of the *cursus Scottorum,* contains such gross historical errors that it is only possible to accept with the greatest reserve the information it gives on the liturgy of the *Scotti.*[2]

To the eighth century also is assigned the composition of a work entitled *Catalogus Sanctorum Hiberniae secundum diversa tempora.* which furnishes, in passing, some minor information on the history of Celtic liturgies.[3]

It may well be believed that it was at the close of the seventh century, the period when Southern Ireland adopted the Roman date for Easter, that the Irish liturgy began to be enriched with Roman features. By way of forming a judgment on these questions of liturgical origins from the scanty historical texts at our disposal, it seems clear, all things considered, that it was Gaul which exercised the primary and chief influence on the formation of the liturgies of these islands; and the British Church must, in its turn, have affected, rather strongly, the development of the Irish rites. It is also to that conclusion that the study of the liturgical texts leads us.

IV. *The Liturgical Year.* The following allusions, occurring as variants in the *Communicantes* of the Stowe Missal (Warner's edition, pp. 11, 12), acquaint us with the principal feasts of the *Proprium de Tempore* observed at that period in the church where this Missal was in use: *In Natale domini.—Kalendis* (The Circumcision).—*Stellae* (Epiphany.—*Pasca.—In clausula pasca* (Low Sunday).—*Ascensio.—Pentecosten.*

[2] See *Lit. Celt.*, cols. 2990-2991; W. Levison, *Bischof Germanus von Auxerre und die Quellen zu seiner Geschichte* (*Neues Archiv*, XXIX, 1903, p. 150).

[3] See *Lit. Celt.*, cols. 2991-2993.

It should be noticed that the ceremony of the New Fire, unknown to the ancient Greek, Roman, and Gallican books,[4] was carried out in Ireland from at least the seventh century. As proof we have the following passage from the biographical notes on St. Patrick written by Muirchu, about 690 A. D.: "*Sanctus ergo Patricius sanctum pasca celebrans incendit divinum ignem valde lucidum et benedictum, qui in nocte refulgens a cunctis pene planitiem campi habitantibus visus est.*"[5]

Besides the feasts of the greatest saints of the Christian Church at large, those of national saints (St. Patrick, St. Columba, St. Bridgid of Kildare) were kept early in the Celtic Churches, as is proved by calendars, martyrologies, and other texts.

V. *The Mass.* We have made elsewhere a detailed analysis of the rites and prayers of the Mass (*Lit. Celt.*, cols. 3005-3014). Here we can do no more than point out certain peculiarties known to us through the Stowe Missal.

In the preparatory part of the Mass we find the text of a litany of the saints containing, besides the names of apostles, martyrs, and confessors honored by the universal Church, twenty-six names of Irish saints, both men and women (ed. Warner, pp. 3, 14).

Some of the rubrics of the Missal are composed in Irish. The words *Lethdírech sund* ("here a half-unveiling") which occur before the Gospel are followed by the Latin rubric: "*Dirigatur Domine*" *usque* "*vespertinum*" *ter canitur . . . hic eliuatur lintiamen de calice* (p. 7), which would seem to imply that it was usual to begin by partly uncovering the chalice and the oblations by removing a first veil, the complete unveiling not taking place until the offertory (cf. p. 9). The three aforementioned verses of the *Dirigatur* were sung three times, and then after the partial unveiling was sung, again three times, the formula: *Veni, domine, sanctificator omnipotens, et benedic hoc sacrificium preparatum tibi. Amen.*

The *Te igitur* is preceded by the words: *Canon dominicus pape gilasi* (p. 10).

Following the *Memento etiam domine* we find a list containing

[4] L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien*, Paris, 1920, p. 264; J. G. Carleton, art. "Festivals and Feasts (Christian)" in James Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (V, 1912, p. 846).

[5] Ed. Whitley Stokes, London, 1887, p. 279.

the names of more than one hundred just persons of both the Old and the New Law, and a certain number of Irish and other saints. Among these last we notice the names of the three immediate successors of St. Augustine in the see of Canterbury: Laurence, Mellitus, and Justus (pp. 15-16).

St. Patrick, already mentioned in the opening litany, is here too. His name will figure a third time in the *Libera nos, domine,* after those of the holy apostles Peter and Paul (p. 17).

After this last formula the *Pax* is given. We may remark that in all Celtic tongues the word used to denote a profane kiss (for example *pok* in Breton) is derived from the word *pacem* (the kiss of the liturgical pax). (Cf. *Lit. Celt.,* col. 3012-3013).

VI. *The Divine Office and various rites.* It would seem that considerable latitude was left to the monasteries in the ordering of the canonical office. The monastic rules form our chief source of information in this matter (see *Lit. Celt.,* cols. 2986-2988, 3014-3018). In the article quoted we have pointed out what is to be gathered from the ancient texts, liturgical and others, concerning sacramental rites (cols. 3019-3024), funeral rites (cols. 3024-3025), exorcisms, blessings, cursings (cols. 3025-3026), and, finally, the consecration of churches (col. 3026).

VII. *Characteristics and influences.* Finally, what is there specifically and fundamentally "Celtic" in the liturgies of these islands? This is just what seems to us difficult to make clear. In describing the mode of compilation of Irish liturgists, E. Bishop made use of the expression "eclectic or tinkering method". "Eclectic by temperament in the domain of liturgy", he has written elsewhere, "they respect nothing, but disfigure every scrap they can lay their hands on." In the liturgical texts of Celtic provenance we find a mixture of elements from Roman, Gallican, and also from other sources.[6]

But it is much less in liturgical texts than in the freer effusions of private prayer that we must look for the characteristic features of ancient Christian Celtic piety. Let anyone read their "breastplates" (*loricae*), their litanies, the prayer of Colgu Ua Duinecda, the prayer of St. Brendan, the so-called "confession" of St. Patrick, the still

[6] E. Bishop, *Liturgica historica,* p. 166. See also a private letter quoted by Dom A. Wilmart in *The Bobbio Missal: Notes* (H. B. S., London, 1924, p. 57, n. 1).

popular "breastplate" of that saint, and many cognate prayers,[7] and he will be struck by their original turn of expression, inspired by an imagination somewhat vagrant; by their suppliant repetitions, their verbal diffuseness, their outpouring of confidence and self-surrender, and, not unfrequently, by the highflown diction which prevail in these texts. These prayers have enjoyed great popularity. Very often they have been the object of a superstitious vogue, as if they were a kind of charm. To judge by their introduction into a certain number of collections of prayers in use in England and on the Continent, or by the imitation of them that we find in these collections, it seems clear that they were relished in those countries from about the eighth to the twelfth centuries.[8]

The Celtic imagination, then, does not seem to have found free scope in the domain of liturgy properly so called. Chance compilers of chance discoveries, manipulators by temperament or necessity, the fashioners of these liturgies have originated nothing. Mamertus, Bishop of Vienne (c. 470), enriched the Church of Gaul with the institution of Rogationtide, which was afterwards adopted by the Roman Church. Many other Churches, so to speak, contributed their stone to the venerable structure of the liturgy. Celtic Great Britain, Ireland peopled with monks, who swarmed in great numbers beyond the seas, would not have been likely to remain completely outside this movement of coöperation among the Churches. There is at least one fact which seems to imply the contrary. It has already been recorded above; we mean the blessing of the New Fire. Here, to all appearances, is the peculiar contribution of the Irish. It is to them, perhaps even to St. Patrick himself, contemporary as he was of Mamertus, Bishop of Vienne, that we owe the introduction into the paschal liturgy of this picturesque rite with its beautiful symbolism. We may conjecture that the *Scotti*, scattered throughout England, and on the Continent, would have made it known to the Anglo-Saxon missionaries, who, in their turn, would have contributed to its diffusion further afield.[9]

[7] See *Lit. Celt.*, cols. 2983-2986; L. Gougaud's article mentioned in the Bibliography; Chas. Plummer, *Irish Litanies* (see Bibliography).

[8] *Lit. Celt.*, cols. 2982-2983.

[9] See Duchesne, *loc. cit.*; J. G. Carlton, *loc. cit.*

VIII. *Bibliography of sources and modern works published since 1910,* date of the publication of the bibliography appended to my article, *Lit. Celt.*

I. Texts and bibliographical repertories:

The Stowe Missal, ed. G. F. Warner (H. B. S., London, 1906-1915); *Irish Litanies,* ed. Charles Plummer (H. B. S., London, 1925); *The Psalter and Martyrology of Ricemarch,* ed. H. J. Lawlor (H. B. S., London, 1914); F. Duine, *Inventaire liturgique de l'hagiographie bretonne* (Paris, 1922).

The *Martyrology of Ricemarch* was also edited in 1913 in the *Analecta Bollandiana* by H. Delehaye (XXI, pp. 369-407).

II. Modern Works:

1. General: Edmund Bishop, *Liturgica historica* (Oxford, 1918).
2. On the Mass: Mary A. Malloy, *The Celtic Rite in Britain* (*Studies in Language and Literature in Cèlebration of the Seventieth Birthday of James Morgan Hart,* New York, 1910, pp. 366-376).
3. On the Stowe Missal: T. F. O'Rahilly, *The History of the Stowe Missal* (*Ériu,* X, 1926, pp. 95-109).
4. On a rite of the Mass in Scotland: M. V. Hay, *Nescio quo ritu barbaro* (*Scottish Gaelic Studies,* II, 1927, pp. 30-33); also printed in *A Chain of Error in Scottish History* by the same writer (London, 1927, pp. 231-234).
5. Divine Office: R. I. Best, *The Lebar Brecc Tractate on the Canonical Hours* (*Miscellany presented to Kuno Meyer,* Halle, 1912, pp. 142-166); E. J. Gwynn and W. J. Purton, *The Monastery of Tallaght* (*Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy,* XXIX, Sect. C, 1911, pp. 115-179); E. J. Gwynn, *An Irish Penitential* (*Ériu,* VII, 1914, pp. 121-195); by the same, *The Rule of Tallaght* (*Hermathena,* XLIV 2nd suppl. vol., 1927).
6. Hymnology: F. J. E. Raby, *A History of Christian-Latin Poetry from the Beginnings to the Close of the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1927, pp. 131-140).

7. On the "Loricae" and cognate prayers: Wilhelm Meyer, *Gildae Oratio rythmica* (*Nachrichten v. d. kön Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Philol.-hist. Kl., 1912, pp. 48-108); by the same, *Poetische Nachlese aus dem sogenannten Book of Cerne in Cambridge und aus dem Londoner Codex Regius 2. A.* xx (*Nachrichten*, 1917, pp. 597-625); L. Gougaud, *Étude sur les loricae celtiques et sur les prières qui s'en rapprochent* (*Bulletin d'ancienne littérature et d'archéologie chrétiennes*, I, 1911, pp. 265-281; II, 1912, pp. 33-41, 101-127); Mario Esposito, *The "Lorica" of Lathcen* (*Journal of Theological Studies*, XXX, 1929, pp. 289-291).

L. Gougaud, O. S. B.

AN EXPERIMENT IN HISTORICAL METHOD

At the outset it is well to state that a purely personal choice, influenced by the objective of this paper, has included Bernheim's *Lehrbuch* or his *Einleitung* under the term "recent books on historical method."

The subject of the paper will take on greater interest if the necessity and limitation of method are mentioned. In the United States Catholic schools show its need, and non-Catholic schools its limitation. Besides the fewness of Catholic historical productions, nothing so well illustrates the need of method than the restriction of Catholic historians to the narrative or pragmatic type of historical writing, because of the unorganized state of the archives, the dispersion of documents over such vast territories, the lack of appreciation for genuine sources, most apparent when doomed to destruction in attic or cellar; and the lack of extensive reprints. No great sweeping, panoramic history of the Church can be presented to the public, and after all this is the type of truly historical effort, until a multitude of Catholic students are trained in method. Because it is only by means of method that students will organize the archives, perhaps centralize documents into regional depots, cherish any source, however humble, and turn out collections of reprints; and it is this methodic work which will make it possible for the few great Catholic historians to produce history in the permanent sense. What strikes the observer

painfully is the spectacle of the trained scholar whose pen is dry because of the untrained multitude.

Non-Catholic schools in America may be said to possess method in history. For some fifty years these schools have employed the historic method equivalently as an end with the result that tons of printed facts lie unread, and that for one cultured scholar, or accomplished critic, or historian with ideas, there are an hundred excellent bibliographists, statisticians, diplomatists, or what not. Catholics may indulge in discouragement over their situation, but they can never quite reach the pessimism, veiled it is true, pervading a recent book, *The Writing of History* (New York, 1926), which represents the views of a committee appointed by the American Historical Association to study the question of style in writing history. The committee is satisfied that all that is needed is style. It should not be venturesome to suggest that the facts uncovered by method plus style cannot produce history.

No particular satisfaction is found in the existing situation which handicaps the non-Catholic schools with their method as much as the Catholic schools without it.

No discourse on the application of method to Church history can afford to omit a brief reference to the library, not only because it is the treasure ground of facts, wherein lie the possibilities of investigation, discovery, classification, revaluation and artistic synthesis, but because it is the magic creator of awe, a sort of reverential fear, without which the student is handicapped, though interested and talented, but with which he is led to wisdom.

Without dwelling on the many sources in libraries, their essential place therein, and their provocatory allurements for students, guide them to one source as a sample, the majestic quartos of Migne. "Then", writes Abbé Bremond, "the Abbé Migne rises at the gateway of his gigantic forges like a grandiose Titan, and all other encyclopedic efforts vanish as leaves in an autumn wind. Two hundred twenty-one volumes of the Latin Fathers, one hundred sixty-two of the Greek Fathers, one hundred sixty-eight volumes of dictionaries, ninety-nine volumes of French Sermons, what volumes! . . . gold and lead; sandstone and granite."[1]

Matthew Arnold cries out in articulate words for the student:

[1] Denys Gorce, *Petite introduction à l'étude des Pères* (Paris, 1928), pp. 72-76.

"Everything is there, in that immense *Patrologiae Cursus Completus*, . . . religion, philosophy, history, biography, arts, sciences, bibliography, gossip. The work embraces the whole range of human interests; like one of the Middle Age Cathedrals, it is in itself a study for life. Like the net in Scripture, it drags everything to land, bad and good, lay and ecclesiastical, sacred and profane, so that it be but matter of human concern. Wide embracing as the power whose product it is, a power for history at any rate, eminently the Church."[2]

Every library, auxiliary to the application of method, should have a reading room which is organized and strictly maintained as such. For instance, books therein are not for circulation. In this room practical prominence is given to the section of the bulletin board allotted to history, especially by a consistent use of it for all history announcements, bibliographies, required reading, and topic work.

Before taking up the consideration of active application, it may be interesting to mention the class of workers and organization of the same according to time and requirements. While all students in the Church history class at St. Francis Seminary receive practical training in methodology, it is thought best for brevity's sake to emphasize the training received at the present time by those working for the Master of Arts degree, who number seventy out of a total of eighty-two. The workers are all Bachelor of Arts men who try for the Master of Arts degree during three years of theology. The course runs over a period of three years because the curriculum of any one year in theology is approximately three times greater than that of a single year of graduate work in a university. So it comes to pass that the course at St. Francis is timed by thirty months instead of thirty weeks. The university credit of two periods weekly for writing a thesis is multiplied by four, giving the basis for the time required monthly for work on the thesis. The work and time spent are reported monthly by individual students to their major professor, who is available daily except Sundays at a fixed time. It is needless to dwell on the opportunities for applying the historical method afforded by such contacts over so long a period.

The active application of method starts with a distribution of form sheets to each student dealing with eight summarized items which are divided as follows: two sheets briefly describing the make-up of a thesis, including information regarding a table of contents, biblio-

[2] *Essays in Literature* (Everyman's Lib., 1924), pp. 127-128.

graphical divisions, foot-notes, quotations, and specimens; two sheets enumerating standard methodologies; three sheets demonstrating the double margin plan for note taking, with a specimen index therefor; two sheets outlining a syllabus for a social history of Catholics in the United States; four sheets demonstrating a card index system; one sheet on how to review a book; one sheet containing an historical syllabus adapted from the *Introduction* of Langlois-Seignobos; sheets varying in number presenting general or special bibliographies of Church history. Besides the employment of the sheets in thesis preparation, every student keeps in touch with them so as to be prepared to answer one question taken from them for each written examination in the three year course.

At this juncture each student is given a work on the historical method and a first-rate source of Church history is assigned to him. He is expected to make a detailed report of both assignments on loose leaf, typewriter-size sheets, according to the double margin system of note taking. The professor in conference always asks one or more questions in reference to the reports. He may ask for instance, why the chapter on "Formation" in Dr. Guilday's *Introduction* is the best in the book, or "Do you think that an historian can actually meet Langlois-Seignobos' requirements of dispassionateness?" or "Doesn't Professor Allen Johnson insist beyond reasonableness on doubting?" or "What is to be thought about Professor Fling's introduction of such philosophical guides as Bergson, James, and Eucken?" and so on. In reference to sources he might ask: "What do the Roman and Arabic numerals refer to in the Index volumes of the *Official Records of the Rebellion?*" or, in order to get real interest in Migne, "Did you know that the four index volumes of the Latin Fathers cost fifty men over ten years of labor?"

As time progresses students according to need or liking are informally introduced to the better known auxiliaries of the historical science, and they are usually given opportunity to read more than one methodology, though required to report on one only.

The field of investigation is purposely limited to American history for the majority of students, and this for many reasons, among which may be mentioned the retention of student interest for America and its interests. The field is naturally limited to eventual narrative or pragmatic productions because of the workers' limitations, and because of scattered archives, many documents of which are not yet available

in print. Dr. Guilday makes a declaration to this effect when he writes that American Catholic histories are limited to biography because of the dispersion of sources.

The title of the thesis is the last to be chosen but it always crystalizes a particular subject in a limited field.

The first year is spent in reading general and special works which serve to outline the time, people, and ideas, in their political, economic, and social aspects. The bibliography on the subject is pursued. If possible the student is expected by the end of the year to narrow his general thesis field to some part of it. For instance, at the beginning of the year he is told to look up lay trusteeism, and by the end of the year, from his notes, or from personal choice, or with a suggestion from the professor, he decides to specialize the question about St. Louis parish in Buffalo.

The second year is spent in reading sources and auxiliaries on the specialized part. Considerable judgment is developed during the course of this year. The student is intrigued by the action which acknowledged Bishop Hughes's sole ownership of church property in the city of New York, and denied it, by state legislation, through efforts of a group of laymen, in the city of Buffalo.

Half of the third year is spent in answering the question: "Have I covered all the available sources on my special subject?" At this juncture internal criticism takes shape by grouping the facts, then interpretation aids in forming conclusions, which may be given added significance, if they throw light on the larger issues involved—in the case of lay trusteeism, the constitutional and traditional state ideas regarding ecclesiastical property, and the natural and positive Catholic ideas regarding property of the Church.

A plan is now submitted for the thesis, and needless to say, at least several plans are successively made, before the student may go ahead.

Writing the thesis follows and it is thought that the style is greatly aided by a two year course in a minor called Oral English (eight semester hours), in which composition in cultural topics is stressed. Before the final typing, if revision is deemed necessary, the thesis is always checked over by a competent and independent third party.

The thesis is then typed according to the form common to graduate schools.

It may be interesting to note that twelve out of a class totaling fifteen, all of whom tried for the degree, were successful this year.

Within the regular organization is a *Berichte* Society composed of thirteen students, who are engaged in the work of translating and editing the *Berichte*. They meet once a month for the purpose of submitting index cards of reference to places, events, institutions, persons, and whatever will ultimately need illustration. Besides this the members discuss uniformity in translating, unity of style, the provenance of various subject matter, the trustworthiness regarding matters of fact in letters the main purpose of which is to secure financial aid, and questions referring to some main features in the letters. For instance, a check is being made on all favorable and unfavorable comments found in the letters on American politics. Ultimately this will enable historians to make some interesting general conclusions.

The members of the *Berichte* Society are furnished with a full bibliography on their subject. They are convinced of the importance of the source, especially in reference to the time and territory covered, to the people, movements and ideas, to the authorship personnel, and most of all to the relationship of the contents to contemporary national developments.

A successful application of methodic synthesis requires certain basic principles which, though intangible, are real. No attempt will be made to enumerate all of these, but for the purpose of demonstration, the following are offered.

Standing at the threshold of historical inquiry the student must be suffused with the truth that the Catholic Church is the mystical body of Jesus Christ, which embraces all men and time. This primary truth acknowledged, no fact becomes isolated. Introduction then follows to the nature of history as such, abstracting from the foregoing principle, which follows the action, direct or indirect, of mankind and so raises it above the physical sciences, which are mathematical, and therefore, quantitative. For human history is mainly qualitative, that is, not encompassed by formulas. Monists, who dominate all the non-Catholic schools, reduce history to formulas. These resemble the sixty-seven keys, which are arbitrary, or conventional, necessary to interpret Wagner's music. Similarly, given the historical formula, the key is possessed to discover and explain history. Following comes emphasis on the truth that facts are a medium of history, that is, a refractory, or a simple transparent agency. The monistic schools practically maintain that the possession of facts is equivalent to the

possession of the truth. If this were so the exposed negatives of a camera would have a decided advantage over positive human classifications. Writers of history feel their work accomplished if they present facts to their readers, who, if any, are expected to digest them via private interpretation—much like bibliolatrists who place the Bible into the hands of anyone, satisfied that the truth will out by mere contact. In some cases the writers undertake to interpret the facts with personal monistic thought, not realizing that monism is an effect of the same and cannot rise above their level. The student is then impressed with the discord between any honest scientific historical effort and exclusion of consideration of the history of the Catholic Church in the United States. The absence of a satisfactory treatment of it in widely read American texts by non-Catholics, may be laid to the lack of books on the history of the Church here, but discounting this, it is certain that there is a disdain, or an ill-concealed apathy, or perhaps antagonism, in them, which reveals Catholicism as taboo. This situation is always a death-knell to science. James Ford Rhodes claims that because slavery was avoided as a subject of investigation, the South was barred from "the higher fields of scientific and literary research . . . for the true scientific spirit could never have free play . . . where one subject of investigation . . . must remain a closed book".[3]

The foregoing attitude toward Churches, including the Catholic, is expressed in a book which gives a liberal cross-section of American life, as presented by men representative of it. The book has no chapter on the religious life of America, which is made more disturbing because the editor goes out of his way to tell why. He writes in the first place that he failed to discover anyone who would or could tell the story, and then goes on to declare that there is no moral life in the United States other than that motivated by two principles: "What will people say?" and "Don't get caught".[4]

The incoming student is taught that the Catholic Church is specially an object of historical study because one of its essential characteristics is visibility. Protestantism is limited to historical inquiry respecting itself by mere curiosity or polemical interest because its essential

[3] *History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850* (N. Y., 1893), Vol. I (1850-54), p. 349.

[4] *Civilization of the United States* (N. Y., 1922), pp. v-vi, edit. by Harold E. Stearns.

nature is invisible. The Catholic Church stands on tradition too and therefore presents a wonderful field for investigation. Abandoned by Protestantism, tradition can offer only an academic interest, not being part and parcel of its make-up. The Protestant conception of salvation by insisting on passivity and internalism cuts the individual off from a complete historical survey, whereas the Catholic conception, insisting on individual coöperation and action, makes him the object of historical interest and research.[5]

In concluding it is not venturesome to state that Catholics without method have a much easier task than non-Catholics with method, because it is easier to acquire method than a correct philosophy of life. Catholic scholars may get discouraged over the lack of method, but they never reach the pessimism of non-Catholic historians of the United States over the popular lack of interest in the history they write. The pessimism is made greater because they do not seem to know that it is their monistic philosophy which adds death to dead facts, which indeed living folks shun.

In applying method proper insistence should be made on the love one brings to his subject, and on the distinction between indifference and impartiality. The majority of theorists on method give the impression that you cannot be an historian without being a Robot. But few in practice have escaped being men with a passionate interest in their subject.

For the purpose of illustrating this point no better quotation occurs than one taken from the preface of Pierre de la Gorce in his monumental five-volume work on the ten-year religious History of the French Revolution. He writes in part:

> Though the events reported herein are more than a century old, they awaken emotions as yet poorly settled: whence the need of a definite effort to retrace equitably happenings which would seem by their very age to have entered the realm of historical peace. There is a kind of impartiality born of indifference. I have neither hope nor desire to attain to this; in telling the Christian trials of our fathers, I do not dare to give assurance that my heart will never beat quicker over their sufferings for Church and God. If at the beginning of this work I promised to be unmoved, I would risk deceiving others as well as myself, two equally odious errors. There is another kind of impartiality: that which lodges, not in the abdication of personal thinking, but in a strict respect for the truth; that kind of impartiality, which never alters a fact, though in itself displeasing, which never mutilates a text, no matter how

[5] *Ecclesia* (Paris, 1927), pp. 311-312.

inopportune the text may be, which never knowingly disfigures the characteristics of a human soul, though it belong to an enemy. It is this superior kind of impartiality, this gift of complete justice, that I ask God grant to me, like a light emanating from Him, as a favor of His goodness.[6]

To increase interest in method a quotation is given in reference to the subject of Catholicism in the United States made by a Frenchman who spent about twenty years here as a professor at Princeton and the University of California. He writes in a recent book:

Confronted by these eccentricities or these violences [sectarian], one thinks about the admirable work of Roman Catholicism in Europe, about the grandeur and stability of its doctrines, about the dignity of its customs, of the miraculous tact which keeps the ecstasies of the saint within decent bounds; but above all one thinks of its artistic creations, and of its manner of nourishing both body and soul without ever degrading either. Catholicity numbers twenty million at present in the United States. It appears to be the lone representative overseas of true spirituality, and the only support in the face of the coldness and uncertainties of official Protestantism, or the violence of sectarianism. It will be both interesting and helpful to follow the progress of Catholicity there. America has left its special psychological imprint on it too. With its new churches, without venerable cathedrals and shrines, spurred on by the activity and competition of rival sects, Catholicity without the cassock in America, is far from offering the same attraction as ours. It prospers in America like in a truly mission land, and indeed it very well seems to be the only religious body which has the words of eternal life, for so many who have been uprooted in their physical and spiritual lives.[7]

More heart may come to those who are working along critical lines by reviving for the moment the following extract from a letter written by James Ford Rhodes on November 25, 1921: "With your [John T. Morse, Jr.] great power of generalization you must count me . . . as being in no way a good Christian, so far as religion is concerned. I am not a Jap or a Chinaman, and therefore belong to a Christian civilization, which, however, I fear is doomed to destruction, and one reason is that the Church, except the Roman Catholic, has lost its power. The Roman Catholic Church will endure, according to Macaulay, when the rest of civilization will expire. . . ."[8]

How reach the great masses in America who are truly uprooted,

[6] *Histoire Religieuse de la Revolution Francaise*, 5 vols. (Paris, 1922-1924), I, 18th ed., Preface, p. x.

[7] Regis Michaud, *Ce Qu'il Faut Connaître de L'Ame Américaine* (Paris, 1929), p. 127.

[8] M. A. De Wolfe Howe, *James Ford Rhodes* (New York, 1929), p. 321.

except by a suitable presentation of Church History? How present the history without the workers? How get the workers without the training with the tools? How secure the tools without the method?

If only to convert and thereby save America, method would be a justifiable instrument, and it is thought it would be a powerful one to help to keep Catholics within the Church.

PETER LEO JOHNSON.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Jews in the Christian Era: From the First to the Eighteenth Century and Their Contribution to Its Civilization. By LAURIE MAGNUS. (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co. 1929. Pp. 432. $5.00)

This book by Laurie Magnus comes from the pen of a man whose family traditions have a bias for historical writings. Our book under review is no fact-finding product. Masculinity of style and vigor of mental grasp are evident on every page. Facts, apparently irrelevant, are tied together by a revelatory insight into the philosophy of history. There is freshness of viewpoint, and certain historical incidents glow with new meaning and appreciation. Scholarly without being pedantic, crystally clear without an excess of appeal to popular style, it is written with a deep sympathy for the evolving story of Israel's spiritual life during the difficult and unhappy Christian centuries. Moving tactfully between Apologetics and Polemics, it is an interpretation and not a vivisection. The progressive story of Israel's efforts to maintain his religious and educational identity in an ever-changing cultural environment and, during this adjustment, to contribute to the treasure trove of civilization is the purpose of the volume. From Philo through Saadia, Maimonides and Spinoza to Mendelsohn is one continuous thread of liberalizing Jewish aspiration. From this point of view Laurie Magnus appraises the cultural contributions of the Jews to Christian civilization.

His opening sentence is quite characteristic. "The most essential contributions to the Christian Era were Jesus and the Hebrew Bible." The failure of humanity to give to the Jews credit for these gifts is equaled only by its intolerance and persecution. This double aspect is the burden of his historical inquiry.

Let me briefly review in his own language his main thesis, as it slowly unfolds through four hundred pages. The Jew entered the Christian Era under a handicap. Imperial Rome could not understand him. Juvenal, Tacitus, and Cicero wrote sneeringly of Judaism, Monotheism, and the Jewish mission. Yet Virgil's Fourth Eclogue in his charming vision of the future is saturated with Hebraism and Jewish Messianism. Many converts accepted Judaism. Philo was the statesman and philosopher of the day who interpreted Judaism to the Greeks, and Hellenism to the Jews, and that is his greatest service. Pico della Mirandola, a student of Philo, introducing Hebrew into the Platonic Academy at Florence, becomes thus the reconciler of Hebrew and Greek, Plato and Christ.

The humanistic movement has its philosophic birth in Philo of Alexandria.

The destruction of the Temple and of the Jewish nation by Rome did not lead to the extinction of Israel and Judaism. Scattered, the Jew became self-centered, and found safety and happiness within the walls of the school. The misunderstood Pharisees carried the people and its religion through the valley of the shadow after the triumph of Christianity. Thus a nation was converted into a religious community, and its ideals cannot be judged sanely from the outside and by those who left its ranks. In the densest darkness of those first three tragic centuries of the Christian Era the Messianic idea still glowed cheerily for the Jews. The academy at Jabne prevented disintegration from within and assimilation from without. The fence of the Torah became a defense and a fortress. Had the Jews Romanized their customs or Christianized their beliefs, something valuable, which they thus preserved by resistance, would have been lost to the world.

"The Jews of the Dark Ages were a people without an historian." That same period reveals striking Hebraic cultural influences on Christian Europe. Jerome's reconstruction of Biblical studies cannot be appraised without his debt to Jewish sources, and the legacy of the old world to the Middle Ages could not have been transmitted in its completeness without Jerome's Jewish teachers. The same applies also to Luther. Nor can that same era be appreciated without a true valuation of Mohammed's Jewish background and the later creative contacts of Moor and Jew in the Semitic Renaissance in Spain.

A marked change was coming over the outer life of the Jews. Circumstances in Europe forced him to develop a faculty for barter. In trade he found a means of livelihood; in the Torah he found a retreat from persecution. Through the Torah, the Talmud, and religious discipline he withdrew within a dream world where he found vision, cheer, and the Messianic hope. Within these narrow confines he gained "Utopia in space, and Eternity in Time". The gain of this faculty of vision lent the distance to Heine's lyre, the leap to Spinoza's thought, the architectonic to Disraeli's statecraft and, perhaps, the boldness to Rothschild's speculation.

Saadia, born in 882, was the first Jewish philosopher who, in direct descent from Philo, enabled Hellenism to return to the East via the Mohammedan and the Jew. From Saadia the line leads to Aviceberon, Maimonides, and Spinoza who finally brought the Jewish leaven of liberalism into the speculation of the non-Jewish world.

The Middle Ages of the Christian feudalism had no place for Israel. Again, their only *terra firma* was the Torah, the only thing which they could call their own. In Spain during the tenth, eleventh, twelfth, and

thirteenth centuries, the Torah in its widest implications was studiously developed. Here Semitic humanism was in its efflorescence. Jewish philosophers were carriers and critics of Aristotelianism, and kept the consciousness of scholarship alive for the awakening west. Although the Christian states were anti-Jewish, Albertus Magnus, Roger Bacon, Thomas Aquinas, Edmond Rich, and Robert Grosseteste were seeking from Jewish books the bridge from the old to the new learning, or rather from the old to the new world. Thus in a cultural sense the Jews were the first Europeans.

After the expulsion from Spain the seats of Jewish learning were transferred to France, Germany, and Poland, and the Jews lost in expansiveness, but gained in concentration. Unable to live in the world, the Cabala furnished an inner world of mystic speculation. The Cabala "engendered visibility in darkness, cheerfulness in sorrow". Yet the same Cabalism influenced Christian Europe through Reuchlin, and leavened the religious influences identified with the Reformation. The Reformation was the Italian Renaissance under Northern skies from Pico della Mirandola and others via Reuchlin to Luther. The influence of Hebraism is evident in the interest displayed by Cromwell and the Puritans in the visit of Menasseh ben Israel.

Chapter nine is the most absorbing part of the book. Spinoza comes in for a most appreciative treatment, and his argument leads directly to the cultural influence on Germany of Moses Mendelsohn. In other words, "Philo and Mendelsohn meet across the stretch of centuries beyond the ruin of inhospitable states, and pool their gifts for the increase of civilization". Both were unifiers, and what one did in Alexandria, the other did in Berlin. Our provocative book closes with a moral: Christian civilization has been enriched by the guarded treasures of Jewish thought and the retarded powers of Jewish action, and its future depends in part upon its ability to quicken these resources.

This book is, therefore, wholly interpretative. Its emphasis on the liberalizing tendency in Israel for eighteen centuries is meant for Christian readers essentially. Aside from an occasional over-emphasis of the Jews on the continuous philosophic influence on humanism, the book is easily the best which has appeared for years in the English language in this particular field.

ABRAM SIMON.

Washington, D. C.

Life in the Middle Ages. By G. G. COULTON, M. A., Hon. D. Litt. (Cambridge Anthologies). In four volumes. Vol. I, *Religion, Folklore, and Superstition.* With 13 illustrations. Pp. 162. $3.00. Vol. II, *Chronicles, Science, and Art.* With 16 illustrations. Pp. 154 text. $2.40. Vol. III, *Man and Manners.* With 9 illustrations. Pp. 168 $2.40. Vol. IV, *Monks, Friars, and Nuns.* With 6 illustrations. Pp. 362. $4.00. (New York: The Macmillan Company; Cambridge, England: at the University Press, 1930.)

The historical writings of Dr. Coulton begin to occupy an increasingly larger space on our shelves, for his output in the last few years has been considerable. That they deserve their place goes without saying. No serious student of the Middle Ages can afford to neglect the work of a scholar who has such unrivalled command of the sources for monastic history, who writes with such sincerity and distinction of style, and who, finally, has so definite a point of view. By unduly concentrating on the latter Catholics have tended, perhaps, to overlook the real profit they can derive from a study of Dr. Coulton's work which is a storehouse of information and a valuable introduction to the sources and literature of its period. We may, if we will, disagree with the author's method or with his generalisations; but if so, neglect is out of the question—we must study all the more carefully books which are widely read and quoted at the present time. If we consider that they represent chiefly one side of medieval life, albeit a very true one, then the remedy lies to our hand: hasty and ill-considered criticism must give way to an equally exact and laborious study of the sources.

Herein lies the value of the work under review. It represents to some extent a body of *pièces justificatives* and an *apologia* for Dr. Coulton's position, consisting of documents translated from six languages and covering a very wide field. This new edition of the *Medieval Garner,* which first appeared twenty years ago, has been split into four conveniently sized volumes. It is more than a reprint, for the whole book has been considerably enlarged, especially the fourth volume, by the addition of fresh matter and notes. The compiler's intention is set out in the preface to the first edition which is here retained. His book is intended for the "increasing body of readers who wish to get at the real Middle Ages; who, however impatient of mere dissertations and discussions, are glad to study genuine human documents, and to check the generalisations of historians by reference to firsthand facts".

The documents themselves are a rich and varied selection, mostly from printed sources which are unavailable for those who lack access to a good library. There are old friends like St. Jerome, St. Bernard, Caesarius of Heisterbach, Etienne de Bourbon, up to and including the

Paston Letters and Sir Thomas More; the great collections of the Maurists are well represented and there are besides many extracts from chronicles less well known, the *de apibus* of Thomas of Cantimpré, the Chronicle of Don Ramon de Muntaner, the Limburg Chronicle, to take names at random. There are few aspects of medieval life which do not find illustration. In the fourth volume we are given an excellent set of extracts from Ekkehard, including the story of the adventures of the monk Heribald among the Huns, which Miss Waddell has told so well in the *Wandering Scholars.* Among so much that is good it is ungrateful to criticize; as in the case of an anthology of verse everyone is bound to have some favorite pieces which he would like to have included.

Where so wide a field has been covered it is inevitable that some errors should have crept in, and since Dr. Coulton has had few opportunities of bringing the work up to date the wonder is that they should be so few. In the first extract of the first volume we have Ralph Glaber's well known passage on the Millennium. Glaber is describing a fire at Rome and he speaks of the multitude hastening to "the Confession even of the chief of the Apostles". This has confused Dr. Coulton who, in a footnote on page 2, explains the Confession as

> the part of the choir in which the celebrant makes his confession before saying mass. This was usually just in front of the altar steps. See Dom Martène, *De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus,* lib. i. c. iv, art. 2 *ad fin.*

The error is not uncommon—we have even known *confessio* in Glaber's sense translated as confessional—but it is surprising to find a scholar of Dr. Coulton's exactitude falling into the trap. The "Confession" to which the people ran in St. Peter's was, of course, St. Peter's tomb (*behind* the altar, as it happens in this case). Martène is speaking primarily, not of any part of the church, but of a part of the service—the *confiteor* as recited by the priest before the introit of the mass—and his section on this subject is headed *confessionis formulae.* He tells us indeed where this was usually said, but he does not call that *place* the confession. There seems after all to be some truth in the old proverb: *caecum plus scire in domo sua, quam oculatissimum quemque in aliena.* On page 7 of the same volume we reach the passage in which Glaber mentions that the Pope at this time, Benedict IX, was a boy "scarce ten years old". Again Dr. Coulton gives a footnote:

> "The foulness of his conversation and life is horrible to relate", notes Glaber of the same Pope on a latter page. This was the lowest ebb reached by the papacy until the 15th and 16th centuries.

Elsewhere Glaber betrays his inaccuracy by giving an alternative version of the Pope's age, and we could have spared this note in exchange for

a reference to Dr. Lane Poole's scholarly paper on Benedict IX and Gregory VI (*Proceedings* of the British Academy, Vol. VIII) in which he shows that the Pope was nearer thirty at the time of his election, and points out that Glaber's chronicle, "a collection of trifling, largely fabulous narratives", is the sole authority for the statements that he was a child of ten.

A similar case arises on page 34 of the second volume, where Dr. Coulton gives an extract from Trevisa's Higsen. It contains the story of Grosseteste's letter to Innocent IV in which he refused to institute the pope's nephew—a child—to a Lincoln canonry, and goes on to describe in picturesque language how "this Robert was summoned to the Pope's court and accursed; then from Innocent's court he appealed to Christ's own throne"; and it ends with the account from Matthew Paris of the dead bishop coming by night in a vision and smiting the Pope with his pastoral staff, so that he was found dead on the morrow. Now this story contains several misstatements of fact. Stevenson, the biographer of Grosseteste, shows that the letter was not addressed to Pope Innocent at all, while A. L. Smith in his lectures on *Church and State in the Middle Ages* gives reasons for supposing it a forgery, although this is doubtful. Moreover there is no contemporary evidence that Bishop Grosseteste was ever "accursed" or excommunicated by the Pope. As the bishop was a strong believer in the papal prerogatives, it is obvious that the extract in question is of doubtful value for "checking the generalisations of historians by reference to firsthand facts", and a footnote to that effect would be desirable.

These instances reveal the difficulties that attach to a compilation of this kind. It is obvious that the student of social history is fully justified in using the chronicle of Ralph Glaber, for example, as an instance of what men could believe and credit at that time, but the ordinary reader who lacks a specialised historical training will find himself at sea when it comes to interpreting the chroniclers and estimating their value. Such a man will find these volumes full of interest but he will not be competent to fit the extracts into their proper setting. Of the value of the work to the student of history it is scarcely necessary to speak. It deserves a wide sale, and no teacher of history who is limited as to the books and time at his disposal should be without it.

In conclusion it may be said that the Cambridge Press have done their work well, and the numerous illustrations, which are a prominent feature, have been skilfully selected. There are practically no misprints and the index is excellent.

DOM ADRIAN MOREY.

Downside, England.

A History of Egypt from the Earliest Times to the end of the XVIIIth Dynasty. By JAMES BAIKIE. In two volumes with 24 full page illustrations from photographs and one map each. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1929. Pp. Vol. I, x, 426; Vol. II, viii, 403. $10.50 a set.)

There is no lack of good English books on the history of ancient Egypt written for the benefit of the general reader mostly by specialists whose widely diverging, or even flatly contradictory views and theories they are bound to reflect. Moreover, in this age of intense exploration, they become fast antiquated, sometimes long before the edition is exhausted. Busy as they are with their personal research work for the results of which they find a ready and convenient outlet in special publications, specialists are loathe to "waste" their time on a new edition, often amounting to a complete recast of a book of popular character and when they do so, as often as not it is with a mind of escaping the importunities of their publishers rather than to gratify the desire of the public.

The present history of Egypt by a scholar, well grounded, it seems, in ancient history and at any rate well versed in the very latest results of Egyptian discovery will, therefore, prove highly gratifying to the "general reader" for whose benefit it was intended.

Not writing for specialists in Egyptology the author, as he informs us in his preface, avoided as much as possible "all discussions of the opposing views of different and differing scholars, although when it became necessary to introduce such controversial matter, he has not hesitated to indicate where his preference lies". He chose rather to adopt "the principle of letting the Egyptians themselves tell their own story wherever the material available made such a course at all possible".

With the same purpose, whether quoting from the special publications of Egyptologists (Breasted, Flinders Petrie, Weigall, Hall, Newberry and Garstang, Carter, Erman, Maspero, etc.), or from the Egyptian texts, the author has avoided further to encumber his narrative "with references to notes at the foot of the page or elsewhere" estimating that "such references are usually more of a nuisance than a help to the general reader while the scholar does not need them". Quotations from contemporary writers are generally introduced by the name of their authors, with sometimes, though seldom, a brief indication of the book from which the quotation is taken, placed between parentheses, at the end of the cited passage. Further identification will necessitate the consultation of the Bibliographical Note at the end of Vol. II. When quoting from an ancient authority, "the author has been satisfied with giving in the text the name of the person responsible for the inscription",

the reader being referred in a general way in the preface to (Prof. Breasted's) *Ancient Records,* for its identification. As for chronology, "a chronological list, giving both the longer and shorter systems of dating has been added", likewise at the end of Vol. II, "instead of sprinkling dates over the text".

It will be for the general reader to decide whether and to what extent his interests were best served by such a plan consistently, not to say ruthlessly adhered to, as it was by the author. The reviewer, in the meantime, is of opinion that some concessions here and there would have been welcome to all classes of readers. It sounds reasonable enough to speak of letting the Egyptians tell their own story. But the trouble is that some of them, kings or generals, are so terribly long-winded, self-conceited and bombastic. The text of many an inscription could have been dispensed with either altogether (the author having summed it up quite satisfactorily) or, at least, in such portions of it as consist of long lines of idle and for the average reader meaningless titulature, or when owing to a lacuna in the original or the presence of a word which for some reason or other cannot be read, a clause remained unintelligible. We grant willingly that long foot notes on points lying beyond the natural sequence of the narrative were not in order in such a book. A few notes, however, here and there to explain words merely transliterated in the text, or so translated as to offer no obvious meaning would have been appreciated by all. As to chronology, what the author says, Vol. I, p. 45-46, of the Egyptian calendar is, in our opinion, quite insufficient even for the general reader; and his *Chronological List of Egyptian Dynasties and Kings,* at the end of Vol. II, may prove more confusing than helpful. The author, surely, must have made up his mind as to which of the two chronologies, that of the *Cambridge Ancient History,* or Petrie's better suited him. Why not have adopted the one he preferred and given its dating (with the other dating between parentheses), if not for each reign or dynasty, at least for each great period at the head of each chapter of historical content? The *Chronological List* might have been prefaced by a short sketch of the sources of Egyptian chronology, including the works of Manetho to which the author refers the reader quite frequently, although no edition of them is mentioned in the *Bibliographical Note.*

With the above reservations which after all may not have the same importance in the eyes of the "general reader" than in ours, Dr. Baikie's book is a very good and substantial contribution to the history of the Land of the Pharaohs, entirely and absolutely up to date. Even specialists, at all events specialists in ancient history will read it with interest and profit, the first volume especially. Not that Dr. Baikie bestowed less care and industry on the second volume, but because in compiling it he

had not at his disposal the same amount of fresh material wherewith to create this impression of novelty so attractive for the modern reader. Recent exploration has contributed but little of real importance to the history of the XVIIIth dynasty with which the second volume is entirely taken up. Even the discovery of Tutankh-Amen's tomb, sensational as it was thanks to a well organized press, and despite its really very great importance from the point of view of Egyptian art, has not added one iota to what we already know of the history of Egypt during the obscure period which intervened between the death of Akhenaten (Amenhotep IV) and the rise of the XIXth dynasty. If anything, it has rather complicated matters by creating new problems, as often is the case when deductions based upon inadequate premises are subjected to the test of fresh, but disturbing rather than convincing evidence.

Not so in the case of Vol. I, the material for which has been astoundingly increased of late years. The 1st Manethonian dynasty especially, and still more the pre-dynastic times (those famous three Manethonian dynasties of "Dead Demi-Gods", once rejected by all historians as entirely mythical and quite on a par with the seven dynasties of gods which had preceded them) appear now, under the pen of the author, in a surprising light of reality. Undoubtedly there are still some regrettable lacunae. The Kings of the second dynasty, for instance, the last one excepted, are still mere shadows. Their tombs lie still silent, buried somewhere under the sands of the bordering desert. And such also is the case for the VIIth and VIIIth dynasties, and again, at least to a great extent, for the XIIIth and the three or four following dynasties (the Hyksos period). These long stretches of historical darkness constitute by far the greatest of the many difficulties which beset the writer who undertakes to give a connected narrative of the history of Egypt. To bridge over these chasms, he is tempted to fill them up with all sort of material which he would not think of considering under other circumstances. Manetho's legends and the wildest modern theories to explain them away are thrown in together and, if I may be pardoned so to express myself, dumped into the gaping hole with apparently no other reason than to have something upon which to cross over to firmer ground. This is a dangerous process. It may lead the author to statements which, if taken at their face value, would bring anything to him but credit as a historian. Dr. Baikie has not always avoided such pitfalls. For instance, in Vol. I, p. 89, concerning Neneter of whom we know nothing save what Manetho relates of him, namely that "in his time it was decided that women might hold the imperial government". Dr. Baikie rightly observes that there is no means of checking up such a statement, and yet he goes on saying in the same breath "we know that women did eventually succeed to the throne in Egypt, on more occasions than one—Hatshepsut being the

outstanding example." I wonder which other examples Dr. Baikie had in mind when he wrote that. Was it Merneit of whom he said (p. 81) that we do not know whether she was the wife of Zet, or an independent queen? Or was it Nitocris (p. 186) "the builder of the third pyramid" according to Manetho, an attribution which Dr. Baikie traces back to a probable confusion between "her other name Menkara, with that of the actual builder of the pyramid, Menkaura"?

The text into which the author has woven the numerous quotations, makes as a rule very good reading. Dashes of humour, and reminiscences of classical literature give life and color to the style where owing to the dryness of matter it shows a tendency to become heavy. It is the more to be regretted that in one instance Dr. Baikie allowed himself so to be carried away by prejudice as to injure his reputation as an impartial compiler of history. In Vol. II, p. 138, speaking of the famous single obelisk of Thothmes III, which Constantius brought to Rome and set up in the Circus Maximus, he says: "In 1587 it was discovered lying there, shattered into three pieces, and was set up on its present position (on piazza St. Giovanni in Laterano) by Domenico Fontana at the instance of Pope Sixtus V who apparently thought he was indicating the triumph of Christianity over Paganism by disfiguring its pyramidion with a cross—a disfigurement which it shares with the other nine obelisks over twenty feet high which are scattered over Rome. It is probably too much to expect that modern authorities at Rome, if they intend to maintain their possession of the noble monuments of national greatness which were filched from Egypt should at least restore them to the nearest possible resemblance to the appearance which they originally presented; but such a restoration would at all events be an admission that Christianity neither needs nor can derive any glory from the disfigurement of the emblem of another religion." The whole tirade is simply *grotesque,* to borrow from the diplomatic vocabulary of the present Lord of the English Exchequer. Did really Dr. Baikie expect Sixtus V to have built in Rome a replica of the temple of Karnak and set up the obelisk in its forecourt, in front of the VIIIth pylon, in order that it might have presented as near as possible the same appearance as when erected by Thothmes IV? Was it not enough that he should have rescued it from the ruins of the Circus Maximus, where it had been buried, broken, some twenty-five feet deep for over a thousand years; that he should have rebuilt it, shaft, pyramidion and all, and set it up again in a place of honor? Does Dr. Baikie forget that Thothmes having died before this obelisk was erected on its base, his own son allowed it to lie neglected for thirty-five years in the building yards at Karnak? And what if Sixtus V placed a cross on the top of its pyramidion? Can, in the eyes of a Christian, the sign of our redemption disfigure anything?

And where, anyhow, did Dr. Baikie see that Christianity was ever loath to admit that she neither needs nor can derive glory from the disfigurement of the emblem of another religion? As for returning to their former home "the noble monuments of national greatness which were filched from Egypt" it is a rather big proposition; Dr. Baikie had better take it up with the League of Nations, or, so far as Italy is concerned, with Mr. Mussolini.

HENRY HYVERNAT.

The Catholic University of America.

Essentials of Civilization: A Study in Social Values. By THOMAS JESSE JONES. (New York: Henry Holt and Company. Pp. xxii, 267. $2.50.)

The complaint that modern life has become on the whole a rather perplexing, unsatisfactory, and even irritating affair is fairly universal. A sense of the futility of the entire business is commonly experienced by those who pause to reflect on the hectic activity that surrounds us. A vast machinery called civilization has been devised for the purpose of living but, unsolved for the majority, remains the more basic problem of the aim of life itself. Thus civilization seems to many a meaningless process that goes on for its own sake without leading to any definite results. As a consequence they derive little satisfaction from the accelerated rate of progress because it only hastens the inevitable disintegration of a thing that has grown too complex to be able to hold together for long. Philosophers give utterance to very gloomy predictions concerning the final outcome of civilization.

In view of this situation a searching analysis of the nature of civilization is a very timely undertaking. Such taking of our bearings is imperatively called for in our days of hopeless disorientation. The author has done his task well within certain limits, for though he rightly emphasizes the unity of life, he fails to point out the overarching purpose that alone can give coherence to human life and fully integrate all social activity. Modern civilization is like a splendidly equipped ship that offers every kind of comfort and diversion to its guests but aimlessly sails the seas, having forgotten that its purpose is to bring the traveler to some friendly port. Naturally, in the course of time the passengers would grow restive, and tire of the meaningless procedure. In spite of the diversions provided for them a terrible weariness would befall them. Analogous to theirs is the case of modern man, who insistently asks the question "Why Civilization?" In part the answer which our author offers is right. "The answer", he writes, to the leading question as to "Why Civilization?" is, therefore, "to be found neither in the

piling up of power, the ingenuity of machinery, and the efficiencies of organization; nor in the abstractions of philosophy and of passive faith in the beautiful, the good and the Divine. Civilization is justified only as it combines faith and works. Modern civilization is now sought throughout the world not only because it brings physical comfort, freedom from precarious dependence on daily or seasonal supplies of food, and larger controls of nature; it is also welcomed because it brings a truer conception of human values and because the man further down has a better chance for life and for the fulness of life." These are, it is true, desirable features that characterize modern civilization but yet they do not constitute its essence. After all, they merely touch the periphery but do not get to the core of the thing. In accord with his idea of the essence of civilization, the author makes religion an agency of civilization, placing it alongside with other agencies such as social organization and art. Outside of this we are in hearty agreement with his lucid presentation of the case.

The author discovers four essentials of civilized society. They are: (1) health and sanitation; (2) appreciation and use of the environment, material and human; (3) effective development of the home and the household, the chief factors of the transfer of racial heritage; (4) the processes of re-creation—physical, mental, and spiritual. The agencies by which these ends are to be encompassed are the government, the industrial order, educational, religious and philanthropical organizations, and art. What the author says about these various agencies is substantially true. It is dictated by sane but not narrow conservatism. The strictures which he passes on the prevalent educational system have become commonplaces. His attitude towards religion and its institutional organization is throughout benevolent and sympathetically understanding. His censures are not inspired by ill will and should not be brushed aside as irrelevant. We may not like it when he says: "All will probably agree that the contributions of religion to civilization have been greater than those of churches," but a very good sense can be read into the remark. He is far from belittling the work of ecclesiastical organizations as the following passage proves: "The historical record of churches compares favorably with those of all other organizations. All have made mistakes; all have suffered from the frailties and selfishness of men."

The optimism of the author contrasts happily with the depressing pessimism so prevalent in modern studies of human progress; its deepest inspiration is a religiously tinged humanitarianism.

C. Bruehl.

Overbrook, Pa.

Plain Reasons for Being a Catholic. By the Very Reverend ALBERT POWER, S. J., M. A., Rector of Corpus Christi College, Melbourne. (New York and Cincinnati: Frederick Pustet Co. 1929. Pp. x, 203. $2.00.)

This is a direct, clear, and vigorous piece of apologetic in popular style, which in founding its plea for the Catholic religion on reason, makes inferentially some telling arguments for the authority of reason itself as "the weapon with which man is armed to hew his way through life" (p. 5). Faith is not blind credulity, nor sentimentalism, nor a special "sense" of the supernatural (p. 38), but "an extension or application to the spiritual world of an ordinary intellectual process . . . without which our lives as social beings would be impossible", namely assent to the truth of a proposition on the testimony of another. To be uncertain or ignorant about the existence of God, or the duration or destiny of the soul, as is the non-Catholic world (p. 194) is to be spiritually blocked, just as ordinary life would be blocked if we required mathematical proofs of our safety of the engineer before getting on a train, or of a barber before risking ourselves under his razor (p. 43). Father Power analyzes the relation between the infallibility of the Church and the inspiration of Holy Scripture by showing how reason first approaches Scripture as historical literature, and discovers in it documentary evidence of a Church divinely founded, and endowed by Christ with infallible teaching power. "From the Gospel, regarded as an ordinary historical record, I prove the existence of the Church and her right to teach divine truth. And from this Church thus historically guaranteed I learn that the Gospels have all the richness and fecundity that result from their being divinely inspired" (p. 93). Having given the historical and rational basis of proof for the Divine authority of the Church, he goes on to show how Protestants, lacking the Divine authority necessary to attest to the inspired character of Scripture, following the methods of "higher criticism", have thrown doubt on the historicity of Scripture records. He might have added that the methods of this criticism have had some positive as well as negative results, reached by slow degrees, without the workers themselves being fully aware of all the implications: that theories of the late origin of the Gospels have been proved untenable; that theories of late origins for Catholic doctrines and principles have been held less and less confidently; and that even to Protestant eyes the Catholic Church, which during the Reformation they refused to see in the Gospels, is becoming more historically recognizable, even by those who no longer accept authority, either from Bible or Church. Father Powers guards his statements on the rational basis of faith by admitting that faith, as a divine "gift", is the assistance given to the intellect to function properly, instead of failing through perversity or weakness to assent to rationally apprehended truth.

W. T. M. GAMBLE.

Washington, D. C.

Tales of the North American Indians. Selected and annotated by STITH THOMPSON, Professor of English, Indiana University. (Cambridge Press. 1929. Pp. xxiii, 386. $6.00.)

The editor of this collection of North American Indian tales frequently expresses the modest hope that it will prove useful to the general reader who wishes to become familiar with the folk-lore of the American Indian. He states that it is his aim, "to make familiar in a compass of a single volume typical examples of such of these tales as have gained any general currency". It is not, however, the general reader alone who will profit by the publication of this work; the specialist in the field—the student of anthropology will appreciate it as a distinct contribution to the science. The facts are abundant; the classifications clear and the generalizations sane; but there has been no attempt to force interpretations nor draw unwarranted conclusions. This by design on the part of the editor; he says: "These tales have been here for a very long time—long enough for the incidents to travel over the entire continent. That they have some sort of relation to myths of the Old World seems in many cases most probable, but until the exact nature of parallels has been studied and a large number of them traced, speculation is perhaps unwise."

The work consists of an introduction; ninety-six selections; a section of comparative notes; a list of the motifs discussed in the notes; sources arranged according to culture-areas and tribes; and a comprehensive bibliography. The tales have been grouped under nine headings: Mythological Stories, Mythical Incidents, Trixters Tales, Journeys to the Other World, Animal Wives and Husbands, Miscellaneous Tales, Tales Borrowed from Europeans, and Bible Stories. The unit in each group is the tale, not the tribe; in the first chapter alone there is geographical grouping.

The mode of procedure in the notes consists of a reference to the incident in the tale; a statement of the motif and a reference by letter and number to a forthcoming study of the compiler. Then follows in geographical order according to Wissler's culture-areas a list of the tribes in whose tales the incident occurs; finally reference is made to previous workers in the field.

There is a tabulated summary of the motifs arranged according to Professor Thompson's study which will be published later—*The Materials of Folk-Literature,* a classification and bibliography of motifs. The sources are arranged according to the tribes within the nine culture areas. The titles mentioned in the sources are given in full in the bibliography; for the most part only original collections of tales are listed. Perhaps the all-embracing table of contents, the extensive logically arranged notes, and careful summary render an index superfluous, but many readers will regret its absence.

SISTER MARY CELESTE.

St. Xavier's College, Chicago.

Francisco de Ibarra and Nueva Vizcaya. By J. LLOYD MECHAM. (Durham: Duke University Press. 1927. Pp. xii, 265. $3.50.)

The present volume is a welcome contribution to the void left by American historiographers between the spectacular explorations that followed the conquest of the famed Tenochtitlán by that prince of conquistadors, Hernán Cortez, and the unromantic advance of the late 16th and 17th centuries into the vast regions of northern New Spain. Through the help given by the Order of the Native Sons of the Golden West, students of California have been enabled to undertake important researches in the rich archives of Seville, the present study being in part the result of its traveling fellowships.

In his biography of this extraordinary conquistador of Nueva Vizcaya, which comprised modern Durango, Chihuahua, Sinaloa, and Durango, the author has given an interesting and detailed account of northern New Spain. This fact may perhaps account for the failure to make the figure of the conquistador stand out in full relief. Ibarra remains throughout but a half revealed figure of whom the reader would like to know more. The first chapters may be said to be introductory, giving the necessary background for the subsequent explorations and achievements of the youthful empire builder, who set out on his career of conquest at the age of fifteen! The following five chapters carry the reader through the eight expeditions undertaken by the tireless explorer and his lieutenants from 1554 to 1567. The eighth chapter is an excellent summary of the economic organizations of the vast region explored and settled by Ibarra, and this is followed by a critical estimate of the conquistador and his achievements. Though slightly harsh in his final judgment, the author is fair in his estimate. The bibliography at the end is particularly useful and adds much to the value of the book.

The narrative is not always clear, and it is not an account that can be read without some concentration on the part of the reader. Still there are many passages that stir the blood and fill the reader with admiration for the indomitable courage of the Spanish explorers in the New World. Of particular interest is the inextricable manner in which the three ruling motives of the Spanish conquistadors: greed, glory, and religion are intertwined throughout the narrative. In the last chapter the author pays a fitting tribute to the soldiers of Christ for the part they took in the exploration and subjugation of Nueva Vizcaya. " To the Franciscan friars all credit is due for the spiritual conquest of Nueva Vizcaya. Practically all entradas were accompanied by one or more of the missionaries, and soon after the settlement of the mines and pueblos a curate was sent by the bishop of Nueva Galicia to look after the spiritual welfare of the inhabitants."

The first martyr of Nueva Vizcaya was a French friar from Aquitaine, Bernard de Cossin, who was massacred by the savage Indians at Guadiana. During the great uprising of 1569 that wiped out most of the conquests of Ibarra in Sinaloa and completely destroyed San Juan, two missionaries who had accompanied the conquistador in all his expeditions, Pablo de Azevedo and Juan de Herrera, both Franciscans, were killed. Throughout the book there are bits of self-sacrifice and examples of that ardent zeal that characterized the Spanish missionary, who went forth into the unexplored regions of the north in search of jewels more precious than gold, human souls. The author quotes Viceroy Enríquez as saying, "Without them . . . we cannot hope to retain our hold in that province, since the religious are absolutely essential to the pacification and subjugation of the natives."

We get but a dim idea of the character and personality of Ibarra. That he must have been endowed with an attractive personality and a forceful character to enable him to set out on his great undertaking at the age of fifteen, there can be no doubt. Passages here and there give us fleeting glimpses of the man, but we never feel we have him before us. As a biography, the book leaves much to be desired, but as a faithful and authoritative account of a chapter in the great development of northern New Spain, it is invaluable. It is to be hoped that the promise of the author to give us a similar account of the exploration, settlement, and organization of Nuevo Leon will be fulfilled in the near future.

C. E. CASTAÑEDA.

University of Texas.

Canada and the United States. By HUGH L. KEENLEYSIDE, M. A., PH. D. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1929. Pp. 396.)

The important attention given to international peace at the present times makes Dr. Keenleyside's work an opportune one. The fact that for over a hundred years two nations, joined by an unguarded frontier of several thousand miles, have maintained mutual peace, is a fact well known to historians. But that peace was maintained many times in the face of difficulties and misunderstandings which might easily have led tc war, is not so well known. Peace advocates and the world at large might well study the triumph of arbitration and conciliation over resort to arms in the New World. Herein lies one of the intrinsic values of the present volume.

The author takes us back to the earliest relations between the two countries: to the days when the Thirteen Colonies decided to sever themselves from the British Crown, and in doing so looked for support to

their northern neighbors, but lately subjects of the King of France. He describes the conditions in both countries, their respective attitudes towards the Revolution, the efforts made to win over the Canadians, and the ensuing failure.

The War of 1812, as the next major encounter between the two countries, is naturally given considerable space and attention. One point not always clear to American readers is Canada's feeling towards the conflict. With the causes which led to that unfortunate conflict, she had little to do. What threatened her was an invasion and conquest, to prevent which Canadians (English and French) rallied to their country's support. The chief result of the war, in the author's opinion, was the growth of nationalistic spirit in both Canada and the United States. He claims also that the "schism between the two branches of the Anglo-Saxon race was broadened and intensified."

The Canadian rebellions, the *Carolina* incident, the annexation movement of 1849, the Fenian raids, the boundary disputes, etc., any one of which might have led to war, were all successfully terminated by conciliation. The accounts of these are well written, although the author's conclusions in some cases are open to question. This is but natural since the field is one which has been hotly contested.

A considerable portion of the volume is devoted to an account of commercial intercourse between Canada and the United States, especially the tariff question, and to immigration and emigration. The opposition to reciprocity shown by the Canadian election of 1911 is ascribed to two facts: "the hostility of the manufacturing and financial interests of Ontario and Quebec, and the latent hostility of Canadians to the United States". It is difficult to claim that it was latent hostility to the United States. The manufacturing and financial interests and the Conservative party claimed that such an agreement would cause loss to Canada and would be the first step toward annexation. They found confirmation of their view in statements of public men of the United States. The people on election day agreed with them, but can it be said that it was latent hostility? It was rather the opposition to a measure which they believed at the time would lessen their independence. At the present time when a tariff war seems imminent, Keenleyside's conclusions are interesting:

> Commonsense, supposedly the crowning virtue of the Anglo-Saxon, will prohibit long-continued tariff wars, and the Dominion, having once displayed her independence, and having brought the American government to a realization of Canada's national status, will almost certainly revive the question of reciprocity. This day may be in the future, but when it comes the United States will be faced with the necessity of making greater concessions than have been offered in the past.

In the final chapter, entitled "World War and Post-War Relations", the reader will find the following statement:

It is probable that in the end, the effect of wartime coöperation between the United States and Canada will be of lasting benefit in its influence on the relations of the two states. But it is beyond dispute that the immediate effect of the war was extremely detrimental; for, although Americans, in general, gained a new interest in and respect for Canada, Canadian dislike for the United States was definitely increased. This fact has been denied or ignored by Canadian politicians, by lecturers, and even by the majority of Canadian newspapers, and it is probably true that the irritation and outspoken hostility of the period from 1915 to 1922 are no longer so potent as they once were. The indubitable fact remains, however, that the effect of the war on American-Canadian relations was, because of its reaction on Canada, a serious blow to the friendship of the two peoples, and that time has not yet entirely healed the wound.

With this statement the reviewer finds it difficult to agree. It would seem as if the author places too much emphasis on what he terms the "hostility" between the two countries and not sufficient stress on their mutual friendship. He throws aside the statements of Canadian politicians, lecturers, and the majority of Canadian newspapers and yet gives dogmatic statements on the hostility. Canadian public opinion is something difficult to focus even on more tangible things than hostility. Central, eastern, and western Canada have such different conditions and such diverse viewpoints on many questions that it is hard to form conclusions regarding their views. The author does not tell us how he arrived at his conclusions. In speaking of the appointment of Mr. Massey as Canadian minister at Washington, use is made of the word *colony,* a word which has fallen into disuse as applied to Canada. His views on war and post-war relations are on the whole, however, thought-provoking.

Unfortunately the author has fallen into some historic pitfalls in writing of the *habitant,* the tithe system and Canadian loyalty at the time of the American Revolution. He states the religion of the habitant as follows: "He has a simple, firm, and direct belief in a personal Devil, a literal Hell, and the innate wickedness of man, but in this he was not unique." Does he consider these the main tenets of the Catholic Faith, for the *habitant* was and is loyally Catholic? Besides the Catholic Church has never taught that man is innately wicked. It is an old custom to attribute ignorance to the *habitant.* We might well question how much more education there was at the time in the Maritime Provinces or in some of the Thirteen Colonies. The lack of loyalty on the part of the Canadians during the early part of the Revolution seems to be overstressed.

Although some of his conclusions may not be acceptable to all his readers, Dr. Keenleyside has given us an impartial story of the relations between Canada and the United States. An attempt to deal impartially

with the history of the two countries is one way to remove prejudice, be it American or Canadian, and to ensure for the future better mutual understanding.

HUGH SOMERS.

The Catholic University of America.

The English Martyrs. Papers from the Summer School of Catholic Studies held at Cambridge, July 28-August 6, 1929. Edited by the Rev. DOM BEDE CAMM, O.S.B., M.A., F.S.A. (Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons. 1929. Pp. ix, 310. $2.50.)

Slowly and with a methodic precision which has won general approval the *Acta Sanctorum* of the English martyrs is nearing completion. Beginning with Challoner's *Memoirs of Missionary Priests and Other Catholics of Both Sexes that have suffered Death in England on Religious Accounts from the Year 1577 to 1684* (London, 1741), which contains brief biographies of over four hundred Catholics who died for the Faith and which brought together all that had been published on the subject from 1582 when Allen and Bridgewater printed the first accounts of the English martyrs, down to our own days when Pollen and Camm and others took up the systematic study of the sources, a select library of books has appeared on the subject; all that remains apparently to be done is a complete martyrology based upon these studies. The late Father John Hungerford Pollen, S.J., was a pioneer in the work. His *Acts of the English Martyrs* (London, 1891) was followed by Dom Bede Camm's two volumes of *Lives of the English Martyrs* (London, 1905-1912), the two volumes of the Catholic Record Society publications, *Unpublished Documents relating to the English Martyrs* (Vol. V, London, 1908; Vol. XXI, London, 1919), collected and edited by Fathers Pollen, S.J., and MacMahon, S.J., and by many individual biographies of martyrs and confessors on the calendar of saints in England. Father Pollen's *Sources for the History of Roman Catholics in England, Ireland, and Scotland from the Reformation Period to that of Emancipation, 1533 to 1795* (London, 1921) lists some of these secondary studies.

What is needed is a well-detailed survey and appraisal of all this biographical literature, and there is no doubt that the 1928 Cambridge studies on the English martyrs will make that work easier of approach.

The English martyrs are not well known, even to Catholics of England; although the recent publicity given to the cause of canonization of more than two hundred and fifty martyrs who suffered from 1535 to 1679, has awakened a new interest in their history. The volume under review is not devoted to this biographical survey nor to the lives of the more prominent martyrs, but contains a series of papers on "the historical

events which led to the immolation of so many gallant Englishmen for their faith ". Father Ronald Knox contributes the first paper on The Theology of Martyrdom which is especially valuable for the clarity of definition it offers on the vexed question of the alleged conflict of allegiance that brought so many loyal Catholics to the gallows.

> It is worth while [Father Knox writes] to observe that Rome shows an admirable caution in this respect. Father Garnet, whose interrogators contrived to suggest that he was privy to the hatching of the Gunpowder Plot, has not been beatified, and his case is held over until positive evidence can exculpate him. It is not denied that certain Catholics did, at various times, cherish revolutionary schemes; and, if they were apprehended when so engaged, and condemned on that ground, there is no question of their beatification. Whatever provocation, whatever justification they may have had, they were political agents, and therefore the crown of martyrdom does not belong to them. It is principally, I take it, the difficulty of distinguishing between such political agents and the men who came over to England simply to keep the faith alive, that makes the cause of the English martyrs so cumbrous and so protracted.

The solution of this problem must find its roots in the medieval relation of Church and State; for, the difficulty the martyrs faced was the line of demarcation between their loyalty to the papacy and at the same time to a temporal sovereign in rebellion against the pope. This problem is dealt with in a second paper by Father Bede Jarrett, the Provincial of the English Dominicans. Abbot Smith's essay on The Process of Beatification and Canonization is without doubt the clearest exposition in English on the development of the complicated procedure of the Roman Curia, and contains also a succinct history of the processes for the English martyrs (pp. 50-76). The Vice-Postulator for their canonization, Father Hallett, describes the present status of the Cause of Blessed Thomas More and Blessed John Cardinal Fisher. Ten other essays complete the volume: the Reformation Parliament (1529-1536); Popular Resistance to the New Religion; Catholic Restoration under Queen Mary; The Elizabethan "Device for the Alteration of Religion"; The Climax of the Persecution: the Act of 1585; Franciscan Martyrs in England; The Martyrs of the Secular Clergy; The Benedictine Martyrs; The English Martyrs of the Society of Jesus; and Martyrs of the Laity (1535-1680). Dr. Meagher's paper on the martyrs of the secular clergy contains many interesting and surprising facts which may be lost sight of in the general literature on the martyrs. Of the three hundred and sixteen who have been declared Venerable or Blessed by the Holy See, two hundred and twenty-two were priests, and of this number one hundred and forty-eight were members of the secular clergy. There is a melancholy significance in the fact that eight priests only suffered death during the reign of

Henry VIII, that only three "Marian" priests paid the supreme penalty for their faith, and that from Elizabeth's time to that of Charles II, one hundred and thirty-eight were put to death. The explanation lies in the defection of the hierarchy in Henry's reign and in the inspiration to martyrdom born in the hearts of the priests of Douay and the other continental English Colleges. To Allen, the Moses of English Catholicism from 1568 to 1594, is due the credit for the heroic sufferings of the English clergy for the century between 1568 and 1680.

One of the defects of the volume is the absence of a detailed account of the manner in which these martyrs died. It is not sufficient to use the legal term "hanged, drawn and quartered" to cover a butchery which was so savage and sometimes so unskilful that the marvel remains that so many priests, young and old, deliberately faced the unspeakable, and let us admit, to some extent almost indescribable, tortures awaiting them in their native land. Tyburn Tree is now a hallowed albeit silent witness of these ages of faith; but we should be given a complete description of the rack, the Little Ease, the Scavenger's Daughter, the foul dungeons, the fearful rite of quartering, and especially of such horrible brutes as Topcliffe, Elizabeth's *presbyteromastix*. We need this chapter of English Catholic history as a sedative to the claims generally made for English civilization in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It is gruesome; but to draw the veil of silence over the slaughter of these brave men, alive as many of them were when the butchers actually began their quartering, robs the historian of a chapter in English Protestantism which would help to explain the bitterness of the hatred for the Catholic priesthood bequeathed to subsequent generations. There is a lesson for all time in a detailed description of the savage death accepted by Margaret Clitherow for harboring a priest.

This volume advances a step beyond the publication of source-material which has occupied the attention of English Catholic historians the past quarter-century. It raises to a higher plane of consideration the political, social, and religious motives which underlay the martyrdom for the faith in England. As such, it forms a supplement to the literature already published on the subject, which, however, will remain incompletely treated until we have a general history of the persecution of Catholics in Great Britain and Ireland. For, sheer cruelty never rose to a higher tide in the civilized world.

P. G.

Europe since 1914. By F. Lee Benns. (New York: F. S. Crofts and Company. 1929. Pp. xii, 671. $5.00)

If Mr. Benns' book is not an outstanding one, it is none the less adequate and readable. He has succeeded in compressing a maximum of

facts into a minimum of words. The analysis of the causes of the war is fair except, perhaps, that too much stress is placed upon the *ipsissima verba* of diplomatic correspondence with insufficient emphasis upon the spirit behind them. Again, in describing the end of the war, the author, like most of our historians, loses sight of the vital importance of the Italian and Eastern campaigns. Germany's military collapse was due not so much to her enforced retirement in France, which could have been halted, but to the turning of her left flank by the crushing of Austria, Bulgaria and Turkey. Furthermore, in speaking of the Gallipoli campaign, it would have been well if the author had emphasized what success would have meant in the saving of Russia.

In treating of the peace treaty, the author has been conservative but fair. He is not reckless with charges of bad faith in the matter of the Succession States, though recognising that blunders were made, especially in regard to Austria. His description of the European States since the War is, on the whole, impartial. However, he makes the surprising statement (p. 556) that "the Czechs have a high degree of literacy and are inclined to be both socialistic in politics and agnostic in religion. The Slovaks, on the other hand, had in 1918 a high degree of illiteracy and . . . are for the most part loyal and pious Roman Catholics." Census figures for the entire country (1921) show that, out of rather less than fourteen millions, the grand total of Jews, Protestants, undenominationalists, and members of the schismatic Czechoslovak National Church is only about two and one-half millions. Furthermore, while mentioning the Hus incident as the cause of the rupture with the Holy See, he omits the tacit recession of Masaryk from his previous action before relations were resumed. In his treatment of Austria also there is another striking omission. He makes no reference to Monsignor Seipel and his work as chancellor. Perhaps he was afraid of his Roman purple. Then too, in treating of the French troubles in Syria, he omits all reference to the anticlericalism of Sarrail, which he attempted to apply even to the Moslems. On the other hand, his account of the relations between Italy and the Holy See is quite impartial as is his treatment of Soviet Russia where he confines himself largely to facts with little attempt at interpretation or prophecy. Perhaps the best chapter in the book is the one devoted to the League of Nations and there is a fine one devoted to the agrarian problem of Central Europe which is very sympathetically handled.

In general, Mr. Benns is impartial and accurate, but his *a priori* devotion to democracy rather clouds his judgment of things in those countries which are enjoying tranquility and prosperity, previously unknown, under dictatorships, countries which may never become democratic. Yet the book as a whole can be commended as a successful attempt to portray

the fateful last fifteen years of European history. In addition there is a splendid bibliography and an adequate index.

ANSELM M. TOWNSEND.

Washington, D. C.

The Enlightened Despots. By GEOFFREY BRUUN. (New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1929. Pp. x, 105. $.85.)

This book is one of the series of the *Berkshire Studies in European History,* supplementary reading texts for pupils in high schools and colleges. The book in question is exceedingly well gotten up with appropriate matter and logical divisions. It gives a graphic picture of the eighteenth century when French culture and influence were most widespread. The intellectual temper of the age was rationalistic and materialistic, the idea of God being little more than a First Cause or Creator who never interferes with the machine he has constructed but leaves it to run by itself like a piece of clock-work. Under the leadership of Locke, Voltaire, Rousseau and others these ideas of rational supremacy became imbedded in the mind of the age.

Of course, there was conflict with revealed religion. Metaphysics to the "enlightened thinkers" of the eighteenth century meant all speculations about God and the soul—subjects considered unknowable and, therefore, taboo. Directly in the path of this rationalistic progress, clashing with it at almost every point, stood the Catholic Church. Where the rationalists insisted on man's sufficiency to perfect himself, the Church preached his innate depravity and necessity of redemption. Where scientists vaunted their methods as alone productive of certainties, the Church pointed to the Bible and to the Church Fathers as the sources of the highest truth. Where the philosophers ridiculed everything that was explained otherwise than by reason, the Church proclaimed a belief in miracles and in such mysteries as the Trinity and the Atonement necessary for the salvation of the soul.

That these rationalistic principles should reveal themselves in rulers and in statecraft is only to be expected. Hence the form of government known as the "enlightened despotism" was the result. As Louis XIV of France was the exponent of the theory of the divine right of kings, so Frederick the Great of Prussia became the most brilliant and successful of the eighteenth-century despots and served as a model for his contemporaries. Throughout Europe earnest and ambitious princes strove to imitate him and to apply the principles of "enlightenment" to secure the welfare of their subjects. When the young Frederick came into power, he found two leading dynasties ruling Europe. The first of these, the House of Austria, reigned over some twenty-five million people,

dominating the Danube Valley, Lombardy, Suabia, and the Austrian Netherlands. The second, the House of Bourbon, was master of France, Spain, Naples, and the Two Sicilies. In the predominance of these two powers Frederick recognized a danger to the smaller states of Europe. A third power was needed, he felt, to counter-balance the other two, hence his ambition was to cripple the House of Austria and raise his own Prussia with her five million inhabitants to the rank of a first class power. Seeing the Austrian Empire in the hands of Maria Theresa at the death of Charles VI, Frederick, in violation of the Pragmatic Sanction to which Prussia had been signatory, invited France and Bavaria to unite with him in seizing the lands of the young inexperienced Empress-Queen. When the Prussian despot had secured the coveted Province of Silesia, he deserted his allies and sat back tranquilly regarding their embarrassments.

The next move made by Frederick was the development of the Prussian army which he raised from 80,000 to 200,000 men. He also wrote treatises on the science of warfare for the generals, and, although in his early thirties, he proved himself one of the most brilliant generals of the age. He next reorganized the judicial system and effected the compilation of the first unified code of German law. In all his reforms, however, Frederick showed himself the autocrat and never conceded to popular demands. Imperious in maintaining his royal authority, he curtailed freedom of speech even among his associates and reserved the privilege of criticism for himself.

If Frederick is the outstanding representative of enlightened despotism, Joseph II of Austria and Catherine II of Russia are close seconds. Lesser despots are Leopold II of Austria, Charles III of Spain, Pombal in Portugal, Charles Frederick of Baden, Gustavus III of Sweden, Struensee in Denmark-Norway, and Turgot in France. All of these rulers and statesmen exemplified in greater or lesser degree the doctrine of State Absolutism, called also Enlightened Despotism. With the reins of government in their hands privilege and tradition were contemned; institutions long established such as the Church, the feudal courts, and trade-guilds were ruthlessly suppressed. In this way was dispelled the veneration with which men regarded these august survivals of the Middle Ages. The logical result of such despotism was finally the French Revolution.

While the book is well written and informative and in general fair, exception must be taken to the following statement on page 11: "Yet theology still had a subtle power to warp the reason, and would do so as long as the Church controlled the education of children." As every true philosopher knows, theology does not warp reason but rather aids reason to recognize its inevitable limitations. Not the least commendatory

feature of the book is its bibliographical suggestions for students who desire further reading on the major topics introduced in the study.

CLAUDE VOGEL.

Washington, D. C.

The Kelsey Papers. With an Introduction by ARTHUR G. DOUGHTY, Keeper of the Public Records, and CHESTER MARTIN, Head of the Department of History, University of Manitoba. (Ottawa: The Public Archives of Canada and the P. R. O. of Northern Ireland. 1929. Pp. lxxxiii, 128.)

Anyone who has had occasion recently to work in the Dominion archives must have reached the conclusion that the greater number of Canadian scholars are working on problems connected with the middle west or far west of Canada. Hence it is to be expected that the publication of such documents as the *Kelsey Papers* will be highly acceptable.

The Hudson Bay Company had included in its Report of 1749 what purported to be "A Journal of a Voyage and Journey undertaken by Henry Kelsey, to discover, and endeavor to bring to a commerce the Naywatamee Poets, 1691." The incorporation of the document in the report was for the purpose of answering the charge brought against the Company "that they had not discovered nor sufficiently attempted to discover the Northwest passage into the South Seas". At the time their antagonists questioned the authenticity of the Kelsey Journal. In 1926 there came into the possession of the Public Record Office of Northern Ireland, the original of the Journal. It consists of eleven papers comprising journals, letters, and memoranda, the whole forming a volume of 128 pages in a coarse paper cover. One of the most interesting items is Kelsey's "Accot. of those Indians belief and Superstitions". This, the editors remark, is probably the earliest account of the Plain Indians.

In the version here published by the Ottawa Archives a lengthy introduction, first in English and then in French, precedes the transcript of the *Journal.* The editors discuss the finding of the documents; the Kelsey tradition; the variation in the two versions—that of the Company and Kelsey's own; and the problems which arise respecting dates, locations, and routes. The text has been reproduced verbatim, we are told, with / to mark the end of the line and // the finish of the page. The numbers in brackets indicate the pagination; the dates at the tops of the pages do not appear in the original. A very satisfactory index has been arranged; a facsimile page of the manuscript serves as a frontispiece; and a folding map has been drawn to illustrate the Journals, 1690-1692.

SISTER MARY CELESTE.

St. Xavier's College, Chicago.

A Guide to the Principal Sources for Early American History (1600-1800) in the City of New York. By EVARTS P. GREENE and RICHARD B. MORRIS. (New York: The Columbia University Press. 1929. Pp. vii, 357. $7.50.)

The libraries and archives of the greatest metropolis in the United States possess an untold wealth of historical material, both printed and unprinted, for the study of early American history. These historical resources have been drawn upon by a veritable army of scholars and writers, and yet much valuable material remains still untouched. The purpose of this volume is to act as a guide to these partly unknown and largely unworked sources. "A completely adequate and comprehensive inventory of the numerous depositories within the limits of Greater New York", we read in the Introduction, "would be a work of many years, even if closely confined to the field of American history." The *Guide* itself, which the compilers frankly admit is incomplete and is but a contribution to a better appreciation of the historical resources of the city, is a model of neatness and practicalness. It is to be noted that the *Guide* has been confined to the first two centuries of New York history, 1600 to 1800:—"The great mass of printed and manuscript material dealing with the United States after 1800 has been left untouched." Twenty-four separate libraries furnished the field for the necessary research; and with a key to the abbreviations used, the student can quickly locate the source-material catalogued in the volume. So far as Church history is concerned, the student is referred to Mode's *Source Book and Bibliographical Guide for American Church History* (Menasha, Wis., 1921), and additional references to general collections, not included in Mode, are given. There is an exhaustive list of newspapers and periodicals (pp. 56-84). The major part of the *Guide* is devoted to manuscript collections, and in the section "Ecclesiastical Sources" is listed the archival material for the different denominations which existed in New York during the period under survey. For the Catholic Church little can be given, since, as the authors say, the Catholic Church in New York was under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Baltimore (the dates given are 1783-1810; they should read 1784 to 1815), where in the diocesan archives any unprinted material pertinent to New York's Catholic history up to 1800 would be found; other sources are in the archives of Notre Dame, Georgetown, etc. Since printed collections of sources are included in the volume, it would seem advisable to warn the student of an omission—the great collection of sources for Catholic history published in the two volumes (1608-1838) of Hughes's *History of the Society of Jesus in North America* (New York, 1908-1910).

A volume of such scholarly exactness and neatness never reveals in its

printed pages the almost baffling problems that arise in the course of its construction. There are few sections of the historical field which demand so much patience and good-nature and require a kind of *a priori* acceptance of the fact that errors of omission and commission must *ex natura sua* occur, as in a manual of this kind. The compilers have done their work well, with a broad and keen vision of the object they had in view; and their manual, practically the first of its kind in the United States, will not only furnish a model for other great literary centres, but will likewise inspire scholars to imitation. We cannot have too many works of this kind.

P. G.

The Story of Fay House. By Christina Hopkinson Baker. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Pp. vii, 135. 1929. $2.00.)

This volume is a fitting part of the fiftieth anniversary celebration of Radcliffe College, which was commemorated this past May. Fay House is the present administration building of Radcliffe College. For three-quarters of a century it was a noble homestead, and Mrs. Baker has produced an historical picture of the occupations and interests of those who lived in the house during that time, and upon the land for almost three hundred years.

This stately brick mansion, designed by Bulfinch, was the home of famous scholars and celebrated ladies. In 1885, it was purchased by the Society for the Collegiate Instruction of Women, better known as the Harvard Annex. For many years, Fay House was the sole building of the activities of the Society and of Radcliffe College.

In writing the story of the life of Fay House, Mrs. Baker has given to Radcliffe women a realization of continuity with the past record of the centre of Radcliffe College. In the words of the authoress: "Now all the threads of this past three hundred years are being rewoven. The pattern is new, but many a thread reappears." Throughout the work she has presented interesting historical glimpses of the early life at Harvard, with delightful descriptions of old New England. In fact, she has put old New England between the covers of this book.

The story of Fay House should have a special appeal to all graduates of Radcliffe College and for residents of Cambridge and Boston, but it should have no less appeal to those who are interested in old New England days and ways.

Frank P. Cassidy.

The Catholic University of America.

Englisches Klosterleben im 12ten Jahrhundert. By CLARA KOENIG. (Jena: Frommannsche Buchhandlung, Walter Biedermann. 1928. Pp. 98.)

The title of this monograph by Clara Koenig, *English Monastic Life in the Twelfth Century,* is a decided misnomer. To the casual reader, unacquainted with monastic life, it will give a false impression. We must take into consideration that the author bases her account only on a single source, the Chronicle of Jocelin de Brakelonde, who was a member of the Abbey of St. Edmund at the time. She has carefully followed, it is true, the chronicle in all its details, neatly arranged it in a systematic order, somewhat according to the Benedictine Rule in chapters, and presented the whole in simple, clear language; but she has been guided a great deal in its interpretation by the cynical version of the same chronicle as given to us by Carlyle in his essay on "The Ancient Monk", in *Heroes and Hero Worship.* Carlyle can only regard it in the light of a Scotch Presbyterian, inimical to anything that pertains to the Church of Rome. Consequently the picture of monastic life Miss Koenig gives us is somewhat distorted, although she assures us that it is "a *typical* example of English Benedictine monastic life . . . Es ist uns durch die Aufzeichnungen des Jocelinus de Brakelonda ermöglicht worden, uns an einem *typischen Beispiel* das Leben englischer Benediktinermönche . . . zu vergegenwärtigen" (page 95). In the last paragraph of the dissertation she wishes herself to correct this false impression, and states that "one must not believe that the life in *all* English Benedictine monasteries was exactly the same as has been sketched. . . . Es ist nicht nun gesagt, dass sich das Leben in *allen* englischen Benediktinerklöstern auf ganz gleiche Weise abgespielt hat" (page 96). Why then the title in its broad application?

Jocelin in his chronicle endeavored to record, according to his own words, the good as well as the bad: "quod vidi et audivi scribere curavi, quaedam mala interserens ad cautelam, quaedam bona ad usum, quae contigerunt in ecclesia Sancti Aedmundi in diebus nostris." He appears to have been a man rather advanced in years, whose literary accomplishment gave him some prestige among his brethren. No doubt, in his eagerness to make use of this distinction, he has inserted many little insignificant community affairs, slight misunderstandings between the members as would naturally arise in such a large community, but which one could easily distort so as to mean something decidedly serious, if one were inclined to do so. Some of the events he has recorded may have been mere fabrications as was the case with other chroniclers of the time. Sometimes he only reports from hearsay. Thomas Arnold who edited the *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey,* of which the *Chronicle of Jocelin de Brakelonde* forms a part (*Rerum Brit. Medii Aevi Scriptores,* London,

1890, Vol. I) is of the opinion that the account is not always trustworthy. "If Jocelin's account may be trusted," is a phrase that appears in the editor's introduction.

When Miss Koenig quotes from, or refers to, the *Rule of St. Benedict* (pp. 58, 60, 66, 67, 73, 81, 37 ff.), she is not always accurate in her interpretation. For instance, she states (p. 40) that the abbot often did not take his meals "with the members of the community, but, according to the *Rule of St. Benedict,* Chapter 55, with numerous guests in his *own* house". The 55th chapter of the *Rule of St. Benedict,* mentioned by Miss Koenig, states nothing about the *house* of the Abbot, but about the *table* of the Abbot. "Mensa Abbatis cum hospitibus et peregrinis sit semper. Quoties tamen minus sunt hospites, quos vult de fratribus vocare, in ipsius sit potestate." There were indeed monasteries in England whose abbots lived apart from the rest of the monks, in a separate part of the abbey or even in a separate house. But this was not the custom everywhere; and it was not sanctioned by the Rule.

Furthermore, it is rather strange that the author should omit from her bibliography, or even not know at all, such a standard book on English monastic life, as that written by the learned and brilliant Gasquet, himself a Benedictine, and an acknowledged authority on the history of English monasticism.

The monograph, moreover, appears to be originally a dissertation submitted to the faculty of the University of Jena, Germany, since Miss Koenig acknowledges "the present work to her esteemed teacher" Professor Cartellieri, as is customary in such cases. Now, what, after all has been accomplished? The text of Jocelin's *Chronica* is easily available to everybody and is conveniently printed and arranged with marginal notes by Arnold. Miss Koenig has added little or nothing to our sum total of knowledge on English monastic life except to present Jocelin in German in a pleasing way to the general reader. It was her very task (see her introduction) to compare the conditions in St. Edmund's Abbey with those in other English monasteries and with those in Germany. This is the very thing she did not do. Otherwise the little book is well written.

The Catholic University of America. P. GLEIS.

Economic Causes of the Reformation in England. By OSCAR ALBERT MARTI, PH. D., Professor of History, Central Missouri State Teachers College. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1929. Pp. 219. $2.50.)

The last word upon the causes of the English Reformation has not yet been written. Approaching the problem from an economic point of

view, Dr. Marti states his thesis in a preliminary survey: "The ecclesiastical revolt of the sixteenth century had its roots deeply embedded in the past. No revolution had ever been more carefully prepared and longer delayed than this one that separated almost half of Europe from the communion of Rome. No factors seemed clearer in the foundation and development of the movement than the economic." It may be said at the outset that Dr. Marti's method of approach merits the praise of historical scholars, Catholic and non-Catholic. With a moderation and impartiality deserving high commendation, Dr. Marti has essayed an unbiased discussion of a vexing period of English history; and for the most part he has admirably succeeded.

The volume contains: an introduction written by Professor Shirley Jackson Case of the University of Chicago; a preliminary survey by the author, and five principal topics, *viz.*, The Wealth of the English Clergy; Popular Protest and Revolt against Papal Finance in the Thirteenth Century, 1226-1258; Motives and Movements toward the Disendowment of the English Clergy; Revolt of the Reformation Parliament against Ecclesiastical Exactions in England, 1529-1536; and Economic Factors Tending toward Final Secularization of Church Property in England, 1533-1539.

The first half of the work is based chiefly upon the accounts of the contemporary chroniclers, Matthew of Paris, Matthew of Westminster, Roger of Hoveden, Roger of Wendover, etc. Professor Marti's use of these sources is characterized by an unwonted familiarity with their contents. It is, however, strange that he should see fit to ignore the great collections contained in Rymer's *Foedera* and Wilkins's *Concilia,* both prime sources for the subject. The latter half of the volume, however, reveals a thorough acquaintance with the printed collections and documents of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.

There are certain statements made by the author to which exception may be taken. On page xx, in discussing the evils of clerical wealth and taxes, Dr. Marti says: "The continuous calls for money . . . undermined faith in the teaching of the church." We are ready and willing to admit that the excessive papal taxes did arouse much bitterness in the heart of the English nation toward the Roman Church, but to say that it undermined faith in the teaching of that Church carries the inference too far. Cardinal Gasquet interprets the situation somewhat differently from the same sources:

> The attitude towards provisions and other papal exactions, manifested both in France and in England, was perfectly consistent with absolute loyalty to the pope as sole head of the Universal Church. . . . No suspicion of any disloyalty, still less of any open teaching contrary to the full acceptance of

the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, is to be found in the letters and tracts of the period.

Professor Marti overdraws the pictures of the abuses practiced by Archbishop Boniface of Canterbury when he excommunicated the suffragan bishops and abbots of his province for refusing to pay a tax imposed on them. The true perspective should not fail to state the fact that Innocent IV revoked the sentence of excommunication as soon as news of it reached Rome, thereby demonstrating that the papacy was not content to allow Boniface a free rein in his abuses. Again, the author makes the remark (p. 99), in discussing the major causes to be kept in mind anent Wyclif's denunciation of Church endowment: "A third fact was the Great Schism of 1378 when the prestige of the papacy was shattered by the existence of two heads of the Church neither of which could be logically regarded as legitimate." Needless to say the latter half of this statement is historically incorrect. The question was not whether it was possible to designate the legitimate occupant of the papal throne, but which of the contenders was legitimate. The researches of such scholars as Noël, Valois, Hergenröther, von Pastor, Denifle and others, have taken this question out of the realm of doubt; they are unanimous in accepting the Roman line of pontiffs as the legitimate successors of St. Peter during this period of confusion. Valois has said of this question: "A tradition has been established in favour of the popes of Rome which historical investigation tends to confirm."

Dr. Marti has placed his copious notes and references at the back of his volume, a feature adding to the attractiveness of the book. The book suffers because of the lack of an index. The omissions from the bibliography of Rose Graham's *English Ecclesiastical Studies,* the researches of Professor William E. Lunt on papal finance, and the collections of Rymer and Wilkins mentioned above should be noticed by students. Professor Marti's book may well be welcomed as an important contribution to the field of English medieval history.

John T. Ellis.

The Catholic University of America.

A Survey of Ancient History to the Death of Constantine. By M. L. M. Laistner. (New York: D. C. Heath and Company. Pp. xiii, 613.)

The plan to give to college students a chance for reviewing Ancient History will no doubt find favor with many teachers. Ancient History, representing the beginnings of our own civilization, is commonly taught in the first year of high school, when the young minds are not yet able to grasp the full meaning of those several groups of events which are styled Oriental, Greek, and Roman History. This lack of maturity is

an additional cause of the fact that when the students become college freshmen, they hardly remember the most important facts of those remote periods. The lack of maturity is a powerful help to youthful obliviousness.

The present book is an attempt, probably the first one, to furnish a school text for a college course in Ancient History. It is written in a calm, rather plain, but perfectly dignified style, such as we expect to find in real histories. The author retains this calmness even in those passages in which he sets out to appreciate movements of longer duration or individual facts of great moment. The present reviewer thinks more space might have been given to evaluations of this kind. Our high-school texts as a rule give all the facts which may seem necessary for an educated man's knowledge of the ancient world. The distinctive feature of college treatment should be found in a deeper understanding and a clearer grasp of the causes and effects of events, a more definite insight into the coherence of enterprises and successes and failures. This is evidently the author's aim. The very choice of his chapters cannot fail to give to the student a more general aspect of the various periods of human development. (In spite of the appropriateness of most of the chapters we should wish that the higher divisions of Oriental, Greek, and Roman History were also retained. It is not practical to divide a book of more than five hundred pages simply into thirty-one coördinate chapters without grouping them into a few larger divisions under more general headings.)

In many points we cannot agree with the author. Some sections are disproportionately long. The warlike enterprises of the Mesopotamian states need not be rehearsed with so much detail, while those of Rome might be treated more extensively than is actually done. Little attention is paid to the wonderful architecture of both Chaldea and Egypt. Two hundred and fifty pages for Greek History is far too much, when Rome which is anyhow of greater importance to us, receives only two hundred and twenty. If Greek and Hellenistic culture deserves sixty-eight pages of separate treatment, one should certainly expect for Roman culture more than eighteen. The space devoted to the Philistines might have been given to the Phoenicians, whose influence on civilization does not appear in due light, since they are only incidentally mentioned in connection with other nations. The minuteness with which the wars of the Kings of Israel are described seems out of place in a book like this. What we desire above all is a summary of the Biblical account of the origin and unique religious mission, by which this remarkable people affected the future and the civilization of the whole world. The description of Solomon's temple is incomplete, since it omits the several brilliant courts which surrounded the temple proper.

This leads us to the weightiest charge. The God " who made heaven and earth " plays no part in this book. He is only once mentioned as Yahweh (p. 98). Instead of the creation of the world and of man in particular we hear of the Golden, Silver, Bronze, and Iron Ages fabled about by the ancient poets, and their reversal by the Stone, Bronze, and Iron Ages which are the result of the investigations and discoveries of archaeology. It is perhaps well that the author has only one or two sentences on the Founder of Christianity; if he had said more, it might not give us much edification. The papacy, as is usual with authors of like religious views, is merely the result of circumstances, and has after all nothing to do with Jesus Christ (p. 579). Due credit indeed is given to the Christian apologists who flourished before 313 A. D., though unfortunately their leader, St. Justin the Martyr, is omitted. But the author never enters upon the content of Christian theory and practice; its forces to counteract the unspeakable immorality of the pagan world; and the reversion by Christ's religion of the prevalent ideas concerning women, children and slaves, and human life in general. The religion of Jesus Christ, which eventually regenerated the entire world, is treated in the same chapter and on the same level with the ephemeral secret cults of the " Great Mother", of Isis and Serapis, and of Mithras, which enthralled the educated pagans of the third and fourth centuries with their abominable " mysteries".

In a book written for maturer students the dark sides of the pagan civilization, that is, the complete moral corruption, the general contempt for human life (*confer* the gladiatorial shows), the degradation of man by an inhuman system of slavery, etc., should have been brought out very clearly. Since these features are hardly touched upon, the picture drawn of Greek and Roman culture is absolutely inadequate.

Dr. Laistner's book is a pioneer work, and we should not be too ready to condemn it. May we expect that future issues will eliminate its present shortcomings? May we even hope that in later editions Christianity will appear in the light shed upon it by the Bible and extra-Biblical history?

FRANCIS S. BETTEN.

Marquette University.

Saint Gregory the Great. By Msgr. PIERRE BATIFFOL. Translated from the original French by John L. Stoddard. (New York: Benziger Brothers. 1929. Pp. 292.)

Gregory is called Great because we find united in him all that goes to make for excellence in man as man. He was not a builder; only two comparatively small churches were dedicated by him; he was not a warrior

nor even a great, albeit a skilful, diplomatist. But he mastered the mentality of his time and preached sermons in the churches of Rome which are still read. He was Supreme Pastor, and it is precisely in the fulfillment of this function he rises above his contemporaries and becomes an outstanding figure for all time. He dealt with men, and the building which he erected was not of brick and mortar but a mystical social organism fashioned from souls. The figure presented to us in the scientific pages of Monsignor Batiffol is of a commanding man, a moral fortress resting on the rock of truth. Like a keen scimitar his fine mind cuts at evil with a powerful yet delicately guided stroke; it removes the offending member but leaves no infection to delay the healing of the wound or produce a festering sore.

We regret that the book is not indexed, although the table of contents is helpful in tracing the various questions connected with the pontiff's life. The translation has been criticized in a number of points, *e. g.*, page 28, "the man who was being sent thither (to Constantinople) had the originality of being a monk". (*Cf. Downside Review*, October, 1929.) If "distinction" had been substituted for "originality" the sense would have been better rendered. Other faults can also be found in the translation, such as giving references to French translations of English works rather than referring to the English original. Monsignor Batiffol shares the commonly held opinion that the community of monks near the Lateran was founded by refugees from Monte Cassino (p. 282). Dom Chapman has established that this is not the case.

The moral greatness of Gregory stands out above all in the *Regula Pastoralis*. This is a book for bishops. He rebukes tyrannical bishops who make of their See, "which is intended for the house of humility, a haughty despotism". The true bishop is one who, dead to all carnal passions, lives spiritually, disdains the riches of the world, fears no adversity, and desires only spiritual blessings. The teaching of Gregory on vocations, on the virtue of the monastic life, and the observance of the counsels of the Gospel is wholly admirable and will remain forever. The essence of the contemplative life is to seek God and to live perseveringly in His love, *in solemnitate amoris*; such a life embodies the entire programme of the monastic state.

This work is better adapted to the general reader than the two-volume work of Dudden; it is more critical than that of Abbot Snow; and, while for the young, the life by a Sister of Notre Dame, to which Dom Vonier wrote the introduction (1923), will still serve a purpose, the mature mind will find satisfaction in the more human delineation of Batiffol.

F. A. WALSH.

St. Anselm's, Washington, D. C.

France: A Nation of Patriots. By CARLTON J. H. HAYES. (New York City: Columbia University Press. 1930. Pp. x, 487. $4.50.)

This informing and thought-provoking book is one of a series of economic and social studies of post-war France produced under the auspices of the Columbia University Council for Research in the Social Sciences and through the coöperation of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Professor Hayes, aided by a capable staff of research assistants, has described with impartiality of outlook and ease of style those agencies of French political and social life which directly or indirectly foster the spirit of nationalism.

Patriotism in France is not the result of ethnic or geographic unity, but is a consciously created product to which education, religion, army and navy, press, radio and cinema, national societies, symbolism and ceremonial, all make their contribution. Five-sixths of the French population have attended only the elementary primary schools and these are the most strongly nationalistic of the entire educational system. In an invaluable appendix, the author gives numerous extracts from textbooks in use in the schools. Certain impressions are almost constantly conveyed by these books: the glory of combat, the unique civilizing mission of France and the sole responsibility of Germany for the Great War. Even historians of the prestige of the late Professor Aulard and of Lavisse have lent their names to this uncritical brand of history. Some of the books voice tolerance and breadth of vision; the most jingoistic impress upon the minds of the young lurid pictures of German ruthlessness. It is encouraging to realize, however, that such bellicose texts are not now as numerous as before.

All classes of Frenchmen, Socialists no less than others, are committed with practical unanimity to belief in the need for national and colonial defense against alleged menaces to French security. The army and navy play perforce a conspicuous part in the diffusion of nationalistic ideals. Nevertheless, the onerous burden of compulsory military training has produced its crop of anti-militarists. French Communists, be it noted in passing, are no more pacifist than their Russian confrères. They would merely substitute the defense of the Proletariat for the defense of La Belle France.

The rôle of religion is a significant one. The members of the Catholic Church, to which the majority of Frenchmen belong with varying degrees of adhesion, tend to differentiate between the nation to which they are enthusiastically loyal and the government which may be anti-clerical and hence anathema. It is an interesting paradox that even hostile ministers sponsor in the interests of imperialism the far-famed work of French Catholic foreign missionaries. The majority of French Protestants and

Jews, like the majority of French Catholics, are likely to be devoted to the nation in time of peace and zealous in its behalf in time of war; but there are extremists in all groups: chronic intransigeant patriots, and some whose cosmopolitanism is sufficient to excite suspicion.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of the press in molding public opinion in France, for practically all Frenchmen are literate, and the great newspapers and periodicals, by voicing uncompromising patriotism in an exquisite vernacular, wield untold power. In normal times the press is given comparatively wide latitude, but during a war, exceedingly strict censorship prevails. Due to the relatively backward state of the radio and cinema industries in France and despite the efforts of the French State to monopolize both, these agencies for patriotic propaganda have not been as effective as might be imagined. In France, as elsewhere, great numbers of organizations flourish to keep alive the memory of past national triumphs and to inspire undying love of country, and there, to an unusually high degree, the drama, music, and the plastic arts are devoted to this end.

Professor Hayes gives careful attention to those forces which militate against extreme nationalism, such as regional loyalties and the special religious, racial, and administrative problems of Alsace-Lorraine. He likewise points out that real devotion to the League of Nations and an appreciation of the claims of human brotherhood may be found among many Frenchmen.

All students of civilization should ponder this book deeply and dispassionately. Lest some grow pharisaical over the undoubted presence of much which is oppressively chauvinistic in French life, they should not fail to examine those other studies in the making of citizens of which this scholarly work is a part. They may then learn to distinguish between a legitimate and helpful loyalty to the fatherland and that overbearing and belligerent nationalism of which the fruit is only dust and ashes in the end.

Hunter College. GEORGIANA PUTNAM MCENTEE.

From Quebec to New Orleans. By J. H. SCHLARMAN, Ph. D. (Belleville, Ill.: Buechler Publishing Co. 1929. Pp. 569. $5.00.)

The romantic story of discovery and settlement of the new world, no matter how often recounted, seems never to lose its charm. This is all the more true when authors present with the attractions of style the fruits of thorough research. This statement, we believe, is merited by the present volume—a succinct yet detailed account of French persistence to gain absolute control of that vast region from Quebec to New Orleans. Not only was the struggle against the Indian, savage and deceitful, but also against civilized rival nations such as England and Spain. In de-

scribing the establishment and settlement of the various French posts the author has given a satisfying picture of both leaders and colonists together with interesting details of their precarious position. Beginning with the discovery of America, the movements of European nations towards America are recorded and detailed; characters are portrayed in their respective rôles; unique occurrences are reënacted. The expeditions of Jolliet and Marquette, of La Salle and D'Iberville are depicted no less vividly than the deportation of the Acadians, and the Natchez Massacre, the Chickasaw Wars, the banishment of the Jesuits, and even the social life of the colonists.

Especially interesting and instructive is the part which the Church played from the very start in the exploration and settlement of the western continent. As colonization advanced, so, too, did the missionary movement. The Recollects, the Jesuits, the Sulpicians, and the Capuchins have left their names indelibly engraved on the history of the respective colonies throughout Canada and the United States. On June 16, 1659, Canada was ready for its first bishop, François de Montmorency de Laval, who came to the See of Quebec. At that time Quebec numbered hardly 500 inhabitants and the whole of Canada perhaps 2,200 souls. But what the diocese lacked in numbers was supplied by its vast extent since the Bishop of Quebec had jurisdiction over all the French territory from Quebec to New Orleans. The diocese was entirely too large but although several attempts were made to divide it in the time of Bishop Saint-Vallier, Laval's successor, the latter consistently thwarted every attempt so that nothing more was achieved than a threefold division with three vicars-general dependent on the Bishop of Quebec. By this division made in 1722, the Jesuits received jurisdiction over all the territory above the Ohio River; the Capuchins were assigned the district west of the Mississippi from the Gulf of Mexico to the point of entry of the Ohio, and the Carmelites received the territory east of the Mississippi. The latter, however, had appealed to Rome for a Brief of Prefecture and were finally rejected by the French government whose Gallican views declined to legalize the papal appointment. The Carmelite district was then added to that of the Capuchins.

In each of these districts a member of the respective Order was vicar-general and subject to the Bishop of Quebec. The situation was difficult, for the missionaries were usually few, the colonists often of a lax adventurous type with little respect for authority, while the secular power was frequently more intent on private gain than on the welfare of the people. Moreover, the perpetual absence of a bishop and the difficulty of communication frequently gave rise to complications in the affairs of the Church. But unpleasant as was such friction, still it falls short of the bitter rivalries and unscrupulous intrigues in the political life. To tell

this complex story so well the author not only made use of the latest literature, but also delved into the archives of America and Europe. The result of his investigations is this happy combination of ecclesiastical and profane history, handsomely bound and profusely illustrated by maps and pictures.

CLAUDE VOGEL.

Capuchin College, Washington, D. C.

Benefit of Clergy in England in the Later Middle Ages. By LEONA C. GABEL. [Smith College Studies in History, Vol. XIV, Nos. 1-4.] (Northampton, Mass. 1928. Pp. 127.)

This work, which was presented to the faculty of Bryn Mawr College as a doctoral dissertation, is a formal treatment of the much-discussed right of benefit of clergy in medieval England, its claims and practices. Dr. Gabel introduces the study with a brief survey of the origin of the clerical privilege before the Conquest and traces it down to Henry III's reign. The principal part of the investigation is concerned with the benefit of clergy in England during the later years of Henry III and the reigns of the three Edwards.

Throughout the body of the work Dr. Gabel discusses with admirable clarity such questions as the different kinds of pleas entered by clerics when accused in criminal cases, the restrictions placed upon those who would enjoy the clerical privilege by the secular arm, and the abuses and evils which grew out of the exercise of the benefit of clergy. It is interesting to note that the tendency upon the part of the king's officials to curtail the privilege of clergy in the courts of the realm accompanied similar tendencies in respect to foreign religious being given English benefices and the increase of papal jurisdiction within the realm, which also occur within the period covered by Dr. Gabel's study. Each court was naturally jealous of the other and it is not remarkable to find the secular authorities increasing the qualifications under which a cleric might enjoy this privilege and removing more and more offences from the classification of "clergyable".

As Dr. Gabel points out the sources for a study of this kind are anything but complete. The author has had to rely chiefly upon the record of the gaol deliveries and the episcopal registers of the period for the materials for her investigation. She has handled them well. The bibliography is extensive, and the use of the materials mentioned therein throughout the body of the work gives evidence of the industry and care put forth by the author in the preparation of this monograph. The appendices, one a chart of cases from the gaol delivery rolls of the districts covered by Dr. Gabel's investigation, another a writ which throws light

upon the procedure in the lay court, and the third a mandate from Archbishop Islep of Canterbury ordering a reform in the administrative procedure of the ecclesiastical courts, add much to the value of the work. There is a substantial index, and the work is fortunately free from errors in printing. In fine this is a study which will commend itself to all students of medieval English history.

JOHN TRACY ELLIS.

The Catholic University of America.

Readings in the Economic and Social History of the United States. By FELIX FLUGEL and HAROLD UNDERWOOD FAULKNER. (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1929. Pp. viii, 978. $3.75.)

The publishers advertise this as "a volume which offers a most valuable means of providing the student of American History with a scholarly, authoritative and convenient background of reading material". Its interest, however, is so predominantly economic that the teacher will need to supplement it liberally with readings which emphasize other aspects of our national life.

The volume contains three parts, two appendices, an alphabetical index of readings, and an index. The first two parts occupy the first half of the book and account for the period from the Revolutionary War to the Civil War. The third part, entitled Economic Expansion Since the Civil War, has chapters on manufacturing and the tariff; business consolidation; transportation and communication; finance, currency and banking; recent agricultural tendencies; labor and immigration; and economic imperialism. An editor attempting to condense into one volume source material for such a wide expanse of subjects is faced with the difficulty that the selections will be either so short as to fail to give the reader the spirit of the documents from which they are selected, or that they may be so few as to omit important phases of the subject and to fail to give a balanced treatment of the subjects that are presented. To say that the book under review runs into the latter difficulty is merely to say that a book of selected readings cannot take the place of a scholarly study of the source materials of American history. But it may well "stimulate further delving into the sources," as the editors hope.

W. J. KERBY.

The Catholic University of America.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The programme for the annual meeting of the Association to be held at Boston during Christmas week is about completed. Full details will be given in the October number of the REVIEW. This meeting promises to be the largest and most successful in the history of the Association. The American Historical Association will meet at the same time and place, so that the usual reductions in railroad fare will be offered.

By a *motu proprio* of February 6, 1930, Pope Pius XI has established in the Congregation of Rites a third section for the historical study necessary in the various causes presented to this Congregation. The new historical section has as it head Dom Henri Quentin, O.S.B., and among those named to the commission are: Berlière Mohlberg, Pou y Marti, Gabriel Thery, Frédégand Calley, Delahaye, Newdigate, Peeters, Tacchi-Venturi, Monsignor Kirsch, Angelo Mercati, Tisserant, and Georges Goyau—all well known in the historical circles of Europe and America.

Father Julius DeVos, the author of *Fifteen Hundred Years of Europe* (pp. 600, Chicago, 1925), has announced the publication of a *Panorama of Mankind* in eight volumes. In his prospectus, the author presents the basic theme of the work as follows: "Men have three kinds of lives, the physical, the social, and the mental. They move in three worlds, the material, the cultural, and the spiritual. There is no complete history of mankind unless these three spheres of action are considered. There is a physical, a political, and a mental history, and the two former are less important than the last. The battles of the schools are more important and more interesting than the battles of the armies."

The three sections of the *Rise of the Christian Church*, by L. Elliott Binns, J. W. Hunkin, and J. F. Bethune-Baker (Cambridge University Press, pp. 373), deal with the Hebrews, the life of Christ, and the early traditions concerning Him.

Father A. M. Jacquin, O. P., professor of Church History at the Dominican University of Fribourg, Switzerland, has published the first volume of his *Historie de l'Eglise* (Paris, Desclée, 1929, pp. xvi, 695). This first part treats of Christian Antiquity to the end of the fifth century. The work is not intended for the classroom, but for the general Catholic public, and represents the results of twenty-five years of teaching on the subject. It will undoubtedly be translated, since it avoids the dryness of many of the Church histories we possess today, as well as a certain nationalistic narrowness of approach which in so many manuals militates against a catholic interpretation of the Church's past.

Among the forthcoming volumes of value for the ecclesiastical historian, announced by the Columbia University Press in the *Records of Civilization: Sources and Studies,* are: *Calendar Reform in the Thirteenth Century,* by Mary Catherine Welborn, Instructor in History, Florida State College for Women; *The Council of Constance,* by Louise Ropes Loomis, Professor of History, Wells College; *Helmold: Slavic Chronicle,* by Francis J. Tschan, Associate Professor of History, Pennsylvania State College, President of the American Catholic Historical Association; *Medieval Universities and Intellectual Life,* by Lynn Thorndike, Professor of History, Columbia University; *Orosius: Seven Books of History against the Pagans,* by Irving W. Raymond, Assistant Professor of History, Columbia University; *Pierre Dubois: on the Recovery of the Holy Land,* by W. I. Brandt, Associate Professor of History, College of the City of New York; *Salvian: The Government of God,* by Eva M. Sanford, Assistant Professor of History, College for Women, Western Reserve University; and *William of Tyre: History of Things Done in Lands beyond the Sea,* by Mrs. Emily Atwater Babcock, Instructor in Latin, and A. C. Krey, Professor of History, University of Minnesota.

The Rev. Dr. George Lacombe, Associate Professor of Philosophy in the Catholic University of America, and secretary of the commission for the publication of a *Corpus Philosophorum Medii Aevi* has recently announced the establishment of an international academic union to carry out this great project. The first part of the work, planned to consist of twenty-two volumes, will be confined to medieval Latin translations of the works of Aristotle. As a preparation for the collaboration of scholars in all parts of the world, the Academie Polonaise des Sciences et des Lettres has undertaken the publication of a *Prolegomena in Aristotelem Latinum,* which will contain a list of all known manuscript Latin translations of Aristotle together with their *incipits.*

The *Bishop's Register,* a translation of documents, with notes and introduction by Clifford J. Offer (London, S. P. C. K., pp. 243), is a selected collection intended for the lay reader who may desire some knowledge of the character and contents of an episcopal medieval register.

Recent publications of the Oxford University Press in the field of medieval history include besides Professor Haskins's *Studies in Medieval Culture,* already noted in this journal, a revised edition of Charles Bémont's *Simon de Montfort,* published only in the English translation of Dr. E. F. Jacob; *Ancient Emigrants,* by Professor A. W. Brøgger, which is an attempt to reconstruct the history of the Norse migrations to Scotland in the eighth and ninth centuries; *From Justinian to Luther,* by Dr. Leighton Pullan; a study of *Mallory* as a translator, by Eugene Vinaver; and a selection of the writings of *Wyclif,* edited by Herbert E. Winn.

Beginning with the present year and appearing at the rate of six volumes a year, a new edition of the *Annales Minorum,* by Father Luke Wadding and his followers, will be published. There are two earlier editions of these historical and literary sources: the first published at Lyons (1625-1657) in eight folio volumes, and the second printed in Rome, Ancona, Naples, and Quaracchi (1731-1885) in 25 volumes, also folio. The new form, to follow the latter edition, will appear in 25 quarto volumes, and is offered to subscribers at 100 lire per volume. Inquiries should be addressed to the publication at Collegio S. Antonio, via Merulana, 124, Rome, Italy.

Among the Franciscan Tertiaries, by Nesta de Robeck (London, Dent. pp. 271), includes studies of the lives of St. Louis, Ramon Lull, Angela of Foligno, Margaret of Cortona, and Ippolito Galantini.

The *Antonianum* prints in its April number, "Une liste de Manuscrits prètés au XIIIe siècle à des Frères Mineurs". A continuation of the description of the Archivos del Alto Aragon, by Ricardo del Arco, is given in *Universidad* for January-February.

The Catholic Truth Society has added the following to its pamphlet literature: *St. Margaret, Queen of Scotland,* by Cecil Kerr; *St. Wenceslaus, Patron of Czechoslovakia,* by Mgr. Joseph Hanush; *St. John the Baptist,* by Rev. C. C. Martindale, S. J.; *Life of the Blessed Virgin,* by Rev. O. R. Vassall-Phillips, C. SS. R.; *Blessed John Plessington, the Martyr Priest of Burton,* by Dr. Mary G. Cardwell; the *Soviet Campaign against God* (the protest of Pius XI); a *Popular Guide to Westminster Cathedral*; and the *Prisoners of Framlingham,* by John Booth.

A work of varied worth is the *History of the Modern Church,* by J. W. C. Wand (London, Methuen, pp. 314), which surveys the work of the various Christian bodies in spreading the Gospel without omitting references to their internal policies and development.

A review of the Vatican Council, by F. F. Urquhart, and an account of the Catholic Settlement at Bermondsey are to be found in the May number of the *Downside Review.*

Macmillan has issued the *Papacy in the Nineteenth Century,* by the late Professor J. B. Bury, edited, with a memoir, by Dr. R. H. Murray.

As a jubilee number (1869-1929) of the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* the editors have issued a symposium of essays under the general title, *Soixante Années de Théologie* (Museum Lessianum, Louvain, pp. 123). As the title indicates, the little volume contains more than an historical retrospect of the *Revue* itself. The first article by the secretary, Rev. J. Levie, S. J.,—*A travers Soixante Années* (pp. 7-21), describes the foundation of this celebrated theological journal by Father Piat de Mons,

O. M. C., who was its editor from 1869 to 1895, and contains a trenchant criticism of the higher learning of the clergy in the first half of the last century, together with the story of the difficulties created by ecclesiastical authorities to prevent the success of the new periodical. Only the intervention of Pius IX in 1871 saved the project from episcopal suppression. Father Piat was eighty years old when he relinquished the editorship in 1895, and following him, the Redemptorists (1896-1906), the Jesuits of Toulouse (1907-1920), and from 1921 the Jesuits of Louvain were the responsible editors. Five historical articles make up the rest of the book. Father Pierre Charles, S. J., writes on Dogmatic Theology Yesterday and Today; Father J. Levie, S. J., writes on the Crisis in Old Testament Study; Father J. de Ghellinck, S. J., describes Patristic Studies since 1869; Father A. Vermeersch, S. J., contributes a profound study on Sixty Years of Moral Theology; and Father J. Creuser, S. J., adds an essay, From the Vatican Council to the New Code. The book is well supported by bibliographical notes and appendices, and is especially valuable since we understand that Abbé Humbert's work, *Les Origines de la Théologie Moderne,* I, 1450-1521 (Paris, 1911), will not be completed. Bellamy's *La Théologie Catholique au XIXe Siècle* (Paris, 1904) is now out of date. Very little of scientific value on the history of theological studies in modern times exists in English. Even the late Dr. Bouquillon's article—*Moral Theology at the End of the Nineteenth Century* (*Cath. Univ. Bull.*, April, 1899), lacks historical perspective. The sketches in the *Soixante Années* are the first methodic presentation of the subject written in our times.

Harding and More (London) have recently issued a careful study, *The Elizabethan Persecution: Did its Victims suffer for the old Faith of England or for Treason?*, by A. Hilliard Atteridge (pp. 72).

The Richard Press, London, announces a limited edition of George Cavendish's *Life of Wolsey,* printed from the original manuscript in commemoration of the four hundredth anniversary of the Cardinal's death.

Messrs. Sheed and Ward have recently published in brochure form (pp. 129, 2/6. paper; 3/6. cloth), under the title, *The Fame of Blessed Thomas More,* the addresses given at the More Memorial Exhibition at Chelsea. These were delivered by Fathers Ronald Knox, Henry Browne, S. J., Bede Jarrett, O. P., Lord Justice Russell, G. K. Chesterton, Hilaire Belloc, and Reginald Blunt and are of great interest, though the outstanding feature of the book is, perhaps, the introductory essay by Professor R. W. Chambers entitled "Sir Thomas More's fame among his countrymen". The purpose of the exhibition and of this publication is the raising of funds for a new frontage for the convent wherein ceaseless adoration is maintained "in reparation for the national crime of the

Blessed Martyr's execution". There are two appendices, one containing a brief bibliography of books relating to the Martyr, the other the catalogue of the exhibition which included two sketches by Holbein of the Martyr and his daughter Margaret, graciously loaned by his Majesty, the King, from the galleries of Windsor Castle.

The Reformation in Ireland under Elizabeth, 1558-1580, by Rev. Myles V. Ronan, is announced by Longmans as a study written from original sources.

A Page of Irish History, compiled by the Fathers of the Society of Jesus and published by the Talbot Press, is the story of the old University College in St. Stephen's Green, from 1883 to 1908 (620 pp., 21*s*.).

The *Catholic Library of Religious Faith* is a series of translations of French works, to be completed in 100 volumes, six of which have been issued.

The leading articles in the April number of the *Revue d'Histoire ecclésiastique* are "Fragments attribués à Ariùs", by Gustave Bardy; and "La primatie et le pouvoir métropolitain de l'archevêque de Bourges au XIIIe Siècle" (concluded), by L. de Lacger.

The *Life of Emilie de Vialar,* foundress of the Sisters of St. Joseph of the Apparition (1797-1856), by a member of the congregation, is published by Sands (287 pp.).

The January-March issue of the *Revue d'Histoire de l'Église de France* contains "Les Ordonnances de 1828 et Mgr. Clausel de Montals, évêque de Chartres", by Ernest Sevrin; and the second part of "Le chapitre cathédral de Langres: son organization et son fonctionnement de la fin du XIIe siècle au concordat de 1516", by Michel Le Grand.

M. Louis Battiffol has revised his *Biographie du Cardinal de Retz* which was first published in the series called, *Les Figures du Passé* (Paris, Hachette).

The sixteenth edition of the *Kirchliches Handbuch fuer das katholische Deutschland* (1928-1929), published by the Zentralstelle fuer kirchliche Statistik des katholischen Deutschlands at Cologne (Freiburg i. B., Herder, pp. 223), continues to be the best compendium of its kind in any language. Founded by Father Hermann Krose, S. J., the *Handbuch* has had the benefit of the foremost German Catholic scholarship, and is as a result a model for similar works. One needs but to compare it with the *Official Year Book* (1928) issued by the Church in this country to realize how sadly a similar volume is needed for the United States. The *Handbuch* is divided into eight parts: organization of the Church in general; organization of the Church in Germany; contemporary eccle-

siastical legislation, decisions of the Roman congregations, and civil legislation affecting Church affairs; German Catholic foreign missions; Catholic educational problems; charitable institutions (a well-defined statistical table accompanies this part); statistics of religious organizations in Germany; religious orders and congregations; and ecclesiastical statistics for every section of Germany. There is a pertinent need for such a cyclopedia in our own country.

Historical Brochures No. 2, of the Central Bureau Publications, is *An Heroic Abbess of Reformation Days,* the memoirs of Mother Charitas Pirkheimer, Poor Clare, of Nuremberg (pp. 27, price 15 cents), with an introduction by Rev. Francis Mannhardt, S. J.

It is welcome news to learn (*Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique,* April, 1930, 500-501) that the great enterprise of the late Father Fedele Savio, *Gli antichi vescovi d'Italia dalle origini al 1300,* which the learned and much regretted author meant to be a corrected edition of *L'Italia Sacra* of Ughelli, is to be completed by his confreres.

An addition to the Broadway Medieval Library is a collection of the *Works of Liudprand of Cremona,* translated for the first time into English by F. A. Wright (Routledge, 12*s.*, 6*d.*). This volume gives a vivid account of Liudprand's times (920-972), his mission to Constantinople, and Emperor Otto's attempt to reform the ecclesiastical scandals that centered about John XII.

Among the recent publications announced by M. Nijhoff, the Hague, is volume I of the *Corpus Codicum Islandicorum Medii Aevi,* being MS. No. 1005 in the old royal collection in the Royal Library of Copenhagen. The manuscript dates from 1387-1392, and gives knowledge of Norse culture and the earliest voyages to Greenland and America (475 pp., fol., 360 Dan. crowns).

The letters of the early Portuguese Jesuit missionaries in Africa, Japan, China, and Brazil, first published in 1603-1611, are being reprinted under the part title, *Relacão Anual das Corsas que Fizeram os Padres du Companhia,* volume I of which has appeared (Coimbra, Imprensa da Universidade).

The *African Chronicles of Brother Giles,* by Rev. F. M. Dreves (London, Sands, 293 pp.), is an account, full of human interest, of the new Franciscan foundation in Uganda and of the Catholic missions in that territory, 1903-1928.

Historical Essays, number four, published at St. Meinrad Seminary, Indiana, contains the following: Fourth-Century Baptism Rite, by Victor Goosens; Christians and Spices (concerning early explorations and dis-

coveries), by Robert Hartman; the Bollandists, by Edwin Sahm; the Constitution of the Church, by Jerome Palmer; St. Joseph's Cathedral, Bardstown, Kentucky, by John Hallahan; the Douay-Rheims Bible, by Joseph Meyer; and the Adyeville Diaconal Church, by James Hickey.

Among the accessions reported by the Minnesota Historical Society are photostats of letters and orders, 1683-1687, received from the Bibliothèque Nationale and the Archives des Colonies in Paris, which contain material respecting Du Luth, Radisson, Groseilliers, Hennepin, and other explorers and traders. Photostat copies have also been made of about one hundred items relating to Minnesota and the Northwest, especially the German settlements, the Benedictine communities in Stearns County, Minnesota, and the work of Father Francis Pierz and Bishop Frederic Baraga among the Chippewas. These were taken from *Wahrheitsfreund*, a German Catholic magazine published weekly at Cincinnati from 1836 to 1863. The University of Illinois has volumes 11 and 18 to 24 of this periodical.

Evidences of the useful work of the Texas Knights of Columbus Historical Commission are seen in its distribution of the *Preliminary Studies of the Texas Catholic Historical Society.* Since January, numbers 2, 3, and 4 of volume I have appeared, the first being an account of the early Catholic Explorers of the Southwest, by Dr. Foik, chairman of the commission (pp. 15); the second a translation of Espinosa's Diary of 1709, translated from the original in the Archivo General de Indias at Seville by Father Gabriel Tous (pp. 14); and the third, an account of the Ramon expedition of 1716 as given in Espinosa's Diary of that year, also translated by Father Tous (pp. 24).

The *Harvard Theological Review* for April contains an historical consideration of the Problem of Jesus, by Maurica Goguel; and a discussion of Some Problems in the Criticism of the Sources for Early Buddhist History, by Walter E. Clark. There is a note on an Uncial Fragment of the Gospels, contributed by William H. P. Hatch; and Two Notes on Ignatius and Justin Martyr, by James Moffatt.

The historical contributions to *Thought* for June are a study of Recent Research on the Life of St. Patrick, by Paul Grosjean; a review of the Spanish Plan of Civilization, by Marie Madden; and an investigation of the Catholicism of Dickens, by Theodore Maynard.

Mid-America for April prints W. S. Merrill's evaluation of Bandelier, Archaeologist of Our Southwest; a well-written Episode in Quebec-Louisiana History in which Rev. Dr. P. W. Browne recounts the episcopal career of Bishop du Plessis; an article on Propaganda and the Suppression of the *Jesuit Relations,* by W. R. Corrigan, S. J.; and the story of

Catholic Beginnings in Southeastern Iowa, 1832-1844, by Rev. C. F. Griffith.

A careful study of Comte de Vergennes, Foundations of His American Diplomacy, by John J. Meng, features the December number of the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society.* Other contributions include a further chapter in the history of the Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis, 1855-1928; a biographical sketch of Rear-Admiral James Hoban Sands, by Marian Sands Harris; and a translation of a letter written March 5, 1782, by Baron de Vioménil, Charles Antoine du Houx, to the Marquis de Rostaing, with annotations by John F. Gough.

The *New Mexico Historical Review* for April continues Adolph F. Bandelier's Documentary History of the Rio Grande Pueblos, New Mexico; also Frances V. Scholes's study of the Supply Service of the New Mexican Missions in the Seventeenth Century.

A general meeting of the United States Catholic Historical Society was held at the Catholic Club, New York, May 14, at which an historical paper on Some American Notes in Vatican Diplomacy was offered by Rev. Joseph F. Thorning, S.J. The twelfth volume of the society's Monograph Series, *Pioneer Catholic Journalism,* by Rev. Dr. Paul J. Foik, C. S. C., has recently appeared.

The 1926 *Report* of the American Historical Association (Washington, Government Printing Office), consisting of the report proper for that year and the supplementary volume, *Writings in American History* for the same year (pp. 282), has been distributed to members. It is gratifying to note that these annual reports will soon be brought down to date: a single volume to cover the years 1927 and 1928 is in press and will shortly appear. Miss Grace Griffin's annual bibliography of *Writings* is up to the usual high standard of her careful editing. It is hoped that Catholic teachers and students know this valuable work of twenty-one volumes: they will find listed therein all worth while contributions of each year to Catholic history and cognate subjects. It is also hoped that the Association, either through its endowment or by private subscription, will soon be able to put this project on a more substantial basis so as to insure for all time its continuance and, we hope for many years, under the direction of the present capable compiler.

BRIEF NOTICES

Adam, Karl, *Christus und der Geist des Abendlandes.* (Munich, Verlag J. Kösel und Fr. Pustet, 1928, pp. 60.)

The author, in this small book, traces the spirit of Christianity from its Semitic-eastern origin, through its Greek, Roman, and German influences down to the present Western tendencies of political, cultural, and religious emancipation from the primacy of faith. He asks how long this spirit can go on successfully; how long it will be before Christ is found again?

Ancelet-Hustache, Jeanne, *Les Clarisses.* (Paris, Bernard Grasset, 1929, pp. 236.)

This is another volume in a notable series of French studies on the great Monastic Orders edited under the direction of Professor Edouard Schneider of the Sorbonne. The author has divided the work into two parts; the first treats the Order of Poor Clares of the Colettine Reform from an historical aspect, and the second, outlines the Order's spirit and manner of life. American readers will welcome this delightful volume on the Colettine Sisters since they are well known in many parts of the United States.

Arimont, J., and Brou, A., S.J., *Jésuites Missionaires au XIXe et XXe siècles.* (Paris, Editions Spes, 1928, pp. 106.)

Contains a brief general survey of the missions throughout the world confided to the Society of Jesus and a capable monograph on its mission of Western Bengal.

Bardy, G., *Greek Literature of the Early Christian Church.* (St. Louis, B. Herder Book Co., 1929, pp. viii, 191, $1.35.)

A brief and scholarly resumé of Greek ecclesiastical writings from the Apostolic age to 527, divided into three sections, each with a general summary and a brief bibliography. It will be of service to those desiring an introduction to, or a concise summary of, Greek patristic writings. There is no index.

Baudot, Dom., O.S.B., *The Breviary: Its History and Contents.* (St. Louis, B. Herder Book Co., 1929, pp. xi, 159, $1.35.)

A brief but scholarly introduction to the history and contents of the Roman Breviary. There is neither index nor bibliography.

Boyce, Gray Cowan, Ph.D., *The English-German Nation in the University of Paris during the Middle Ages.* (Bruges, The Saint Catherine Press, 1927, pp. 232.)

A splendid study based upon the *Liber Procuratorum* of the English-German nation. Since this is the most complete of the *Libri* of the four nations into which the university was divided, it is of great importance for the study of the internal government of the university, the granting of degrees and the social life of the students. Dr. Boyce's volume will be of much service to students of medieval institutions of learning.

Cameron, A. (Ed.), *Patrick Hamilton: First Scottish Martyr of the Reformation.* By Several Authors. (Edinburgh, The Scottish Reformation Society, 1929, pp. 100.)

A composite Protestant account of the first victim of Cardinal Beaton's attempt to check Protestantism in Scotland. Hamilton was a Lutheran. The authors have no love for the Church.

Castañeda, Carlos E. *Nuevos Documentos ineditos o muy raros para la Historia de Mexico*, tomo II. (Mexico, 1929, pp. xii, 215.)

Contains the *Historia de todos los Colegios de la Ciudad de Mexico desde la Conquista hasta 1780*, by Felix de Osores, from the Garcia Collection at the University of Texas, where Mr. Castañeda is Librarian. Well annotated; good index.

Clark, Henry W., *History of Alaska.* (New York, Macmillan, 1930, pp. x, 208, $2.50.)

A satisfactory attempt to bring together and summarize some of the recent researches in Alaskan history undertaken by such scholars as Golder, Stefansson, Andrews, Spicer, Farrand, and others. "The Catholics came to the country in 1877 and throve there, due to the direction of Bishop Charles J. Seghers, known as the 'Apostle of Alaska'. The Holy Cross Mission on the Yukon is their great center in the north."

Cochaux, Henri, *Le Pape et l'Italie: les Accords de Latran.* (Paris, Beauchesne, 1929, pp. 186.)

Contains excellent chapters on the Temporal Power of the Pope, the Pontifical States from 1815 to 1870, and the conflict between Pius XI and Mussolini. The appendices carry all the important documents, and there is a map of the Vatican City.

Corpus Catholicorum. Heft 15. *Joannes Cochlaeus: In obscuros viros qui decretorum volumen infami compendio theutonice corrupuerunt expostulatio.* Herausgegeben von Dr. Joseph Greven (Munster, Aschendorf, 1929, pp. xliii, 37. RM. 2. 95.) Heft 16. *Tres orationes funebres in exequiis Joannis Eckii habitae.* Herausgegeben von P. Johannes Metzler (1930, pp. cxxxvi, 103, RM. 9. 30.)

The first of these two volumes contains Cochlaeus's own Latin version of his German account of his controversy with Spengler over Canon Law and the Lutheran Reformation. It possesses a good introduction on the occasion, the persons involved, and the available literature on the subject. The second volume presents the texts of three sermons preached at the funeral of Eck and several poems and epitaphs composed on the same occasion. The introduction contains together with other useful data a brief life of Eck, a list of his sermons and other works, and a bibliography. Both books are typical specimens of thorough German scholarship and criticism and will be valuable for students of the Lutheran Reformation.

Cram, Ralph Adams, *The Catholic Church and Art.* The Calvert Series. (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1930, pp. 121, $1.00.)

A fine sketch of the relation of art to the Faith in all ages, written with

all the profound knowledge and sympathy of America's foremost architect, who is also a philosopher of no mean caliber. A really outstanding contribution to a distinguished collection of studies. But why was it necessary (and it was necessary) to go outside the Church for a contribution of this kind? This is, we believe, the only volume of the series written by one not of the Faith.

CROZIER, P., S.J., *Pour faire l'Avenir.* (Paris, Editions Spes, 1929, pp. 249.)

A series of conferences on the growth of unbelief and religious indifference in France, the causes and consequences of the same, and the true remedies to be applied through Catholic Action.

ELDER, JOHN RAWSON, M.A., Litt.D., Professor of History in the University of Otago, *Pioneer Explorers of New Zealand.* (London and Glasgow, Blackie and Son, 1929, pp. iv, 121, 3*s.* 6*d.*)

Government reports, private diaries, and early colonial newspapers were drawn upon in the writing of this small volume which tells much of the beginnings of a country little known by American students. There are illustrations and maps, but an index is lacking.

ELSON, HENRY W., A.M., Litt.D., and ELSON, DELMA V., Ph.B., B.S., *Workbook for Elson's Modern Times and the Living Past.* (New York, American Book Co., 1929, pp. 352.)

This work was prepared in order to enable the student to put into tangible form the results of his study of the Elson texts, to aid him in forming the habit of consulting library books, and to provide tests of new types. It contains the full apparatus of modern pedagogy.

FRANKFURTER, FELIX, and GREENE, NATHAN, *The Labor Injunction.* (New York, Macmillan, 1930, pp. 343, $5.00.)

A book primarily for the lawyer and economist, but intended also for employers and trade unions. There are given: a history of the legislative efforts to define and limit the use of injunctions, statements of the procedure and proof concerning them, their scope and enforcement, legislation affecting them, and concluding discussions of the issues underlying legislation in existence and that proposed.

GEFFCKEN, JOANNES (Ed), *Der Brief an Diognetos.* (Heidelberg, Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, pp. viii, 127, 1928.)

This brochure, number 4 of the series of Commentaries on Greek and Latin texts edited in German by Geffcken, contains the Greek text of the Pseudo-Justin *Letter to Diognetos* with a critical preface and a commentary.

GLOVER, T. R., *The Influence of Christ in the Ancient World.* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1929, pp. 122, $1.50.)

A well-written study of the state of the pagan world at the time of Christ and the influence of Christianity upon it. There is much about the world and little about Christ who is conceived according to modernist teachings. Still, it will be of use to those desiring a brief conspectus of pagan society at the opening of the Christian era.

GOUGAUD, DOM LOUIS, O.S.B., *Modern Research with special reference to early Irish Ecclesiastical History.* (Dublin, Hodges, Figgis and Co., 1929, pp. 58.)

A series of lectures delivered at University College, Dublin, in April, 1929, on the Irish monasteries of the early Middle Ages, the fate of their manuscript collections, compilers, and pioneer editors of the same (Lanigan, Petrie, O'Donovan, O'Curry, Todd, Reeves), the application of the historical method to the study of Irish history, and some suggestions to present-day students on what remains to be done in the field of Irish ecclesiastical history.

GOYAU, GEORGES, *Rome chrétienne: son visage, son organization, de Constantin au traite du Latran.* (Paris, Flammarion, 1929, pp. 285.)

A unique and scholarly description of the papacy from the fourth to the twentieth centuries, with the imperial palace of the Lateran as the focus of the picture. One of the best studies produced by the Lateran Treaty of February 11, 1929.

GRUBB, ISABEL, M.A., *Quakers in Ireland 1654-1900.* (London, George Allen and Unwin Limited, 1927, pp. 158.)

A study of Irish Quakerism in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries, dealing principally with the history of the spread of Quakerism in Ireland and with the contributions made by the Irish Friends to the social, economic, and religious life of the country.

HARRISON, ADA, *Christina of Sweden.* (London, Gerald Howe, 1930, pp. 96, 3*s.* 6*d.*)

A brief, well-written, and not unsympathetic account of the strong-minded daughter of Gustavus Adolphus, the Protestant hero of the Thirty Years War, and Queen Regnant of Sweden (1632-54) who voluntarily abdicated in her twenty-eighth year in order to embrace Catholicism. After a chequered career, she died in Rome in 1689 at the very time James II was losing the throne of England for his Catholicism.

HART, CHARLES, *The Student's Church History*, Vol. I; Early Period. (London, Burns, Oates, and Washbourne, pp. iv, 124, 2*s.* 5*d.*)

This volume presents a short outline of the history of the Church up to the Edict of Milan in 313. It is well done and will be of service especially to high school students. It is planned to continue the story up to 1929 in successive volumes which in view of the moderate price will be welcome.

HITTI, PHILIP K., Ph.D., *The Origins of the Druze People and Religion, with Extracts from their Sacred Writings.* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1928, pp. 80.)

A study in the origins of the Druze people and their religion, which after an existence of over nine hundred years is still known as one of the mystery religions of Syria. The author concludes that the Druzes are of Persian, rather than of Arabian, stock. The appendices contain extracts from the sacred writings of the Druze fathers.

HYMA, ALBERT (Ed), *Erasmus and the Humanists.* (New York, F. S. Crofts and Company, 1930, pp. 109, $.85.)

Contains an historical introduction on the transalpine humanists; the letter to Servatius; the "Letters of Obscure Men"; two of the "Colloquies"; and "The Praise of Folly". Each is preceded by some data. There is no index. A useful introduction to the subject.

"IONA", *The Story of Saint Brigid.* (Dublin, the Talbot Press, Ltd., 1929, pp. 94.)

The life of Saint Brigid, the "Mary of the Gaels", told in the form of a dialogue and with rare simplicity but with strict adherence to historical fact.

Ireland, School History of. By "A Professor of History." Part I: *From the Colonisation to the Confiscations;* Part II: *From the Flight of the Earls to the Inauguration of Dail Eareann.* (Dublin, M. S. Gill and Son, pp. viii, 92, vi, 122, 1930.)

An ultra-patriotic "history" which significantly ends with the elections of December 1918.

JOURNET, ABBÉ CHARLES, *De la Bible catholique à la Bible protestante.* (Paris, Blot, 1930, pp. 115.)

An excellent historical sketch of the evolution of the Protestant attitude towards the Bible from Reformation times to our own—"La Bible reformée, qu'on a tant vantée, débouche lentement mais sûrement dans la Bible moderniste (p. 74)".

KETELBEY, D. M., M.A., *A History of Modern Times, from 1789 to the Present Day.* (New York, Thomas Crowell Co., 1929, pp. 623, $3.75.)

Boldly written, with especial reference to the growth of nationalism and democratic opinions, this volume presents an interesting and fairly impartial study of European history and its international repercussions during the last century and a half. There is a slight touch of cynicism throughout the work, not least notable in regard to things Catholic. There are chapters on America, which to the author seems only to mean the United States, and in which he is fair though not always accurate, and on the Far East which is well done. A usable though not outstanding book.

KNOWLTON, DANIEL C., Ph.D., and TILTON, J. WARREN, Ph.D., *Motion Pictures in History Teaching.* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1929, pp. x, 182, $2.00.)

A study of the Chronicles of America photoplays as an aid in seventh-grade instruction, based upon an experiment calculated to measure by certain tests the extent to which the photoplays contributed to the enrichment of knowledge, retention of the subject, and creation of interest. A useful adjunct to the films.

LACEY, T. A., D.D., F.S.A., *The Reformation and the People.* (New York, Longmans Green and Company, 1929, pp. vi, 120, $1.35.)

A really fine analysis of the part played or rather not played by popular sentiment during the Reformation, especially in England. Though written

by a leading Anglican scholar, there is little, if anything, with which a Catholic can reasonably find fault. If this is to be taken as a fair sample of the "Anglican Library of Faith and Thought", the succeeding volumes will be awaited with interest.

LAMA, FR. RITTER VON, *Papst Pius XI.* (Augsburg, Literar Institut, Haas und Grabherr, 1929, pp. 189.)

The first third of this scholarly book on the life and works of Pope Pius XI is devoted to a study of his life before he became pope. Among the questions, so important in history, arising in the Holy Father's reign are the Roman Question, negotiations with the Eastern Church, the Russian, French, and Mexican questions, and Catholic Action. All are well treated.

LAMPEN, DOROTHY, *Economic and Social Aspects of Federal Reclamation.* (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1930, pp. 125.)

A study of the evolution of irrigation laws and policies since the passage of the original federal reclamation act in 1902, with a clear statement of existing conditions in the reclamation program. Economists and legislators who desire to know something of the difficulties encountered in the conquest of aridity will appreciate it.

Les Missions Catholiques françaises en 1900 et 1928. (Paris, Editions Spes, 1929, pp. 32.)

Official statistical tables of French Catholic missions in foreign lands showing the contrast in numbers and influence of the French missionaries abroad between 1900 and 1928, and the gradual diminution of French influence due to the lack of governmental coöperation.

MILLOT, CANON, *Ce que c'est qu'une Eglise.* (Paris, Tequi, 1929, pp. 332.)

A collection of sermons and addresses on the liturgical meaning of the dedication of churches and of bells and organs, compiled by the Vicar-General of Versailles.

MITERRE, PAUL, *Saint Bernard de Clairvaux: un moine arbitre de l'Europe au XIIe siècle.* (Geneval, Belgium, De Lannoy, 1929, pp. 192.)

A popular sketch of the greatest religious of his century and of the general conditions of the Church during his life-time.

MOREAU, E. DE, S.J., *Saint Anschaire.* (Louvain, Museum Lessianum, 1930, pp. 152.)

A biography in French of a Benedictine monk eminent for his sanctity and who, because of his great apostolic zeal, merited to be called the Apostle of the North and to be listed among those great national apostles such as Patrick, Boniface, Hyacinth, and others. This biography is especially timely since in these very days the centenary of Saint Anschar, monk of the Abbey of Corbie, France, is being duly celebrated throughout the Scandinavian countries in which missionary fields his labors were blessed with so fruitful an apostolate.

MUIR, RAMSAY, *British History: A Survey of the History of All the British Peoples.* (Yonkers, N. Y., World Book Co., 1930, pp. xx, 816, $3.60.)

The scope of this compendious volume is aptly described by the sub-title. Emphasis is placed upon social and political developments. The tone is mildly patriotic but tends to be impartial. There is an absence of imperialism. Politically there are indications of liberalism and there is an undercurrent of Protestantism, which however does not result in any serious distortion of things Catholic. Designed for school use, with numerous maps, diagrams, and genealogical and chronological tables, it is well adapted for its purpose.

PINARD DE LA BOULLAYE, H., S.J., *Jésus et l'Histoire.* (Paris, Editions Spes, 1929, pp. 238.)

The 1929 Lenten conferences at Notre Dame, Paris. One of the outstanding books of the year in French Catholic circles. Eloquence, erudition, and scholarship of a rare kind are evident in these sermons, the purpose of which is to prove from the history of comparative religions the divine foundation of the Christian Church. Short bibliographies precede each conference, and an analysis of the book takes the place of an index.

SABATIER, PIERRE, *Sainte Roseline: Moniale-Chartreuse (1263-1329).* (Paris, Editions Spes, 1929, pp. 189.)

Nothing so clearly indicates the retirement from the world so thoroughly practised by the Carthusians, as the fact that in spite of the unending flow of saintly souls which it has produced, two only should have been canonised, one the great Bruno, the other, the little known nun whose biography is so charmingly presented here. The chapter upon the mode of life of the Carthusian nun is well done and care has been taken to bring it up to date.

SCHNITZER, J., *Der Tod Alexanders VI.* (Munich, Verlag Ernst Reinhardt, 1929, pp. 127.)

Professor Schnitzer offers in this work an answer to the question: Did Pope Alexander VI die of malaria, as the official history of the popes has it, or did he die by poison which he had prepared for another? After a critical examination of the sources the author concludes that the proof for the pope's death by poison has shocking weight.

SEEBERG, REINHOLD, *Die Geschichte und Gott.* (Bonn, Verlag Fr. Cohen, 1928, pp. 120.)

The six lectures which this book comprises were given at the University of Bonn in 1928. In them the author treats: history and human society; history and evolution; the typical epochs of history; the problem of history; religion and history; and the spirit or trend of history.

TERRY, ALTHA E., *Joanne D'Arc in Periodical Literature 1894-1929, with special reference to Bernard Shaw's "Saint Joan".* (New York, Institute of French Studies, 1930, pp. 127.)

A bibliography of contributions to periodicals on St. Joan of Arc. The compiler makes no claim to an exhaustive or selective catalogue but her list shows an admirable knowledge of the literature on the national heroine of France.

THIBAUT, DOM RAYMOND, O.S.B., *Un Maitre de la Vie spirituelle: Dom Columba Marmion, Abbé de Maredsous, 1858-1923.* (Maredsous, Belgium, 1929, pp. 555.)

The life-story of one of the greatest Irish Benedictines in modern times. This volume will be welcome to hundreds of American priests who were under Father Columba's spiritual direction at Louvain from 1899 to 1909; it should not remain long untranslated.

WILSON and WILSON, *Workbook in United States History for Higher Grades.* (New York, American Book Company, 1930, pp. 254.)

The *Workbook* covers a year's study in American history, comprising eight topics, and is well balanced with bibliographies, outlines, questionnaires, exercises, maps, tests and statistics.

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

MISCELLANEOUS

The Practical Value of Church History. A. J. Brown (*Biblical Review*, April).

Pseudo-History and Pseudo-Psychology. James J. Walsh (*Current History*, April).

The Catholic View of Toleration. Algernon Cecil (*Contemporary Review*, June).

Evangelium und Religionsgeschichte. Alfred Jeremias (*Deutsche Rundschau*, June).

Die Geschichtsphilosophie des 19. Jahrhunderts und die Theologie der Geschichte. Joachim Wach (*Historische Zeitschrift*, 142, 1).

New Material about the Jews of Ancient Rome. H. J. Leon (*Jewish Quarterly Review*, April).

La guerre des Machabées. Hilaire Duesberg, O.S.B. (*Revue Générale*, March 15).

The Roman Index: Origin, Development, and History. John McQuillan (*Truth*, April).

La Papauté et le Problème missionnaire. Louis Ducathay (*Correspondant*, June).

Symbolism in the Gothic Cathedrals. Roxanna Grate (*Catholic World*, April).

Saint Augustin, Apôtre de la Paix. Georges Simard (*Canada Français*, May-August).

Ignatius of Antioch: a Study of Personal Religion. James Moffat (*Journal of Religion*, April).

The First Four Bishops of Rome: a New Study in Historical Values. J. B. McGovern (*Churchman*, April).

Encyclopédies médiévales: sur la "connaissance de la nature et du monde" au moyen âge. Michel de Boüard (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, April).

The Children's Crusade. H. H. Vinnedge (*Historical Outlook*, May).

The People and Public Opinion in the Eleventh-Century Peace Movement. L. C. Mackinney (*Speculum*, April).

Luther's Indebtedness to the Catholic Bible. J. M. Lenhart, O.M.Cap. (*St. Louis Fortnightly Review*, May).

The Reformation as Seen Through a Group Study. T. F. Herman (*Biblical Review*, April).

Los Archivos de la Antigua Chuquisaca. R. V. Ugarte, S.J. (*Boletin del Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas*, October-December).

The First Episcopal Sees in Spanish America. Elizabeth W. Loughran (*Hispanic American Historical Review*, May).

Le catholicisme aux Indies (concluded). Ivanhoë Caron (*Canada Français*, April).

EUROPEAN

The Medical School of Montpelier in the Fourteenth Century. Sonoma Cooper (*Annals of Medical History*, March).

St. Vincent de Paul. Hugh Blunt (*Magnificat*, April).

La vie médicale de Saint Vincent de Paul. Laignel-Lavastine et Jacques Vie (*Revue des Études Historiques*, April-June).

St. Vincent de Paul: First Phase. W. G. Hanson (*London Quarterly Review*, April).

Pierre Dubois: Modern or Medieval? W. J. Brandt (*American Historical Review*, April).

Le Protestantisme en Agenais: la Réaction catholique. A Duremgues (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, April).

Bon San Sebastian nach Salamanca. Ernst Böminghaus, S.J. (*Stimmen der Zeit*, May).

La Colección Prehistórica del Colegio Alfonso XII de El Escorial. César Morán (*Religion y Cultura*, March).

Los Manuscritos Vaticanos de los teólogos salmantinos del Siglo XVI. Cardinal Ehrle (*Estudios Eclesiasticos*, April).

Religious Education in the German Elementary School of the Reformation Period. E. V. Wills (*Biblical Review*, April).

The Modern Liturgical Movement in German Protestantism. G. C. Lund (*Anglican Theological Review*, April).

Religion in Germany, 1830-1930. H. G. Bévenot, O.S.B. (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, April).

Roman Catacombs and Blessed Eucharist. Bishop Shahan (*Missionary*, April).

Roman Catacombs and St. Peter. Bishop Shahan (*Missionary*, June).

Did Savonarola Disobey the Pope? S. M. Hogan, O.P. (*Blackfriars*, April-May).

The Roman Question, Leo XIII, and Signor Mussolini. N. V. Tcharykov (*Contemporary Review*, March).

Cardinal Gasparri. Walter Littlefield (*Current History*, April).

BRITISH EMPIRE

The Knights Hospitallers in England after the Fall of the Order of the Temple. Clarence Perkins (*English Historical Review*, April).

Wolsey. Sir Lewis Dibdin (*History*, April).

St. Pius V and Elizabeth. Maurice Wilkinson (*Month*, June).

State Trials under Charles II. J. C. Muddeman (*Month*, May).

Family Life among Puritans. W. T. Whitley (*Review and Expositor*, April).

Erastianism in the Great Rebellion. Mrs. Chester Kirby (*Church Quarterly Review*, April).

Conspiracy and Conscience: Psychological Study of the Gunpowder Plot. John Knipe (*Churchman*, April).

Robert Parsons and Pope Joan. T. D. Sheils (*Catholic Gazette*, June).

The Cathedral Chapter of Exeter and the General Election of 1705. N. Sykes (*English Historical Review*, April).

The Appointment and Deprivation of St. William, Archbishop of York. R. L. Poole (*English Historical Review*, April).

The Bible in Ireland. E. J. Quigley (*Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, May, June).

St. Patrick: a Study in Missionary Achievement. Francis Shaw (*Irish Monthly*, March).

The Irish School of Medicine. J. D. Hancock (*Annals of Medical History*, March).

The Reformation in Ireland. Joseph Clayton (*Blackfriars*, May).

Ireland and the Vatican Council, 1869-1870. (*Catholic Bulletin*, June.)

Le R. P. Grollier, premier apôtre du Mackenzie. A. Prud'homme (*Mémoires de la société du Canada*, 3d ser., XXIII, sect. 1).

Jeanne Mance, The First Canadian Nurse. Col. Murray Maclaren (*United Empire*, March).

The Epic of the Bush Nuns. George O'Neill, S.J. (*Studies*, March).

UNITED STATES

Catholic and Jewish Population Trends in America. J. Elliot Ross and U. Z. Engelman (*Current History*, July).

Early American (Catholic) Hospitals. J. J. O'Gorman (*Catholic World*, June).

The St. Joseph Mission. George Paré (*Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, June).

Who Introduced the Forty Hours' Devotion into the United States? J. M. Beierschmidt, C. SS. R. (*Ecclesiastical Review*, June).

Church History by Non-Catholic Historians. J. E. Graham (*Truth*, April). IX, George Bancroft.

German Tracts concerning the Lutheran Church in North Carolina during the Eighteenth Century, II. W. K. Boyd and C. A. Krummel (*North Carolina Historical Review*, April).

The Bible Commonwealth of Massachusetts. W. A. Pew (*Essex Institute Historical Collections*, April).

Francis Vigo. Dorothy Riker (*Indiana Magazine of History*, March). A member of Father Gibault's congregation.

St. Mary's, Baltimore. J. C. Walsh (*Catholic World*, June).

History of St. Francis Seminary, III. P. L. Johnson (*Salesianum*, April).

Christian Science and Its Founders. Herbert Thurston, S.J. (*Studies*, March).

A Centenary in Alabama. J. C. Mulhern (*America*, May 31). Spring Hill College.

American Catholic World War Records. D. J. Ryan (*Ecclesiastical Review*, June).

CONTRIBUTORS OF ARTICLES AND MISCELLANY

Rev. ROBERT HOWARD LORD, Ph. D., formerly Professor of History at Harvard University, Assistant-Pastor, St. Cecilia's Church, Boston, Mass., author of *The Second Partition of Poland* (1915), *Some Problems of the Peace Conference* (1920).

Rev. FRANCIS S. BETTEN, S. J., Professor of History, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, author of *Ancient and Medieval History*; *Historical Terms and Facts,* a reference book for students of history (1924).

Miss ELIZABETH WARD LOUGHRAN, M. A., is a contributor to the *Hispanic-American Historical Review, Ecclesiastical Review,* and other periodicals.

Dom LOUIS GOUGAUD, O. S. B., Professor at Farnborough, contributor to various Belgian, English, French, German and Irish historical and theological journals. Author of *Les chrétiéntes celtiques* (1911); *Gaelic Pioneers of Christianity* (1923).

Rev. PETER LEO JOHNSON, Ph. D., is Professor of Church History at St. Francis Seminary, St. Francis, Wisconsin.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

THE ASSOCIATION

The American Catholic Historical Association is a national society for the promotion of study and research in the general history of the Catholic Church throughout the world.

The American Catholic Historical Association was founded at Cleveland, in December, 1919, and is incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia.

MEMBERSHIP

Membership is open to all who are interested professionally or otherwise in the study of the history of the Catholic Church.

Membership is not limited to persons of the Catholic faith.

Membership is secured through election by the Executive Council, upon nomination by a member or by direct application.

The dues are: For annual members, five dollars; for life members, one hundred dollars.

PUBLICATIONS

The principal papers read at the Annual Meeting will appear in the *Catholic Historical Review,* the official organ of the Association.

All members receive the *Catholic Historical Review.*

HEADQUARTERS

The permanent headquarters of the Association are in the John K. Mullen of Denver Memorial Library at the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.